arXiv:1610.09661v1 [math.PR] 30 Oct 2016

Erg_poisson16f.tex

Ergodic Markov processes and Poisson equations (lecture notes)

A. Yu. Veretennikov*

November 1, 2016

Abstract

These are lecture notes on the subject defined in the title. As such, they do not pretend to be really new, probably except for the only section about Poisson equations with potentials. Yet, the hope of the author is that they may serve as a bridge to the important area of Poisson equations "in the whole space" and with a parameter, the latter theme not being presented here. Why this area is so important was explained in many papers and books including [32], [12], and [33]: it provides one of the main tools in diffusion approximation in the area stochastic averaging. Hence, the aim of these lectures is to prepare the reader to "real" Poisson equations – i.e., for differential operators instead of difference operators – and, indeed, to diffusion approximation. Among other presented topics we mention coupling method.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Ergodic Theorem – 1 **3**

3 LLN for homogeneous MC, finite S **9**

4 CLT, finite S **10**

5 Coupling method for Markov chain: simple version **16**

6 A bit of large deviations **18**

*University of Leeds, UK; National Research University Higher School of Economics, and Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Moscow, Russia, email: a.veretennikov @ leeds.ac.uk. The work was prepared within the framework of a subsidy granted to the HSE by the Government of the Russian Federation for the implementation of the Global Competitiveness Program, and supported by the RFBR grant 14-01-00319-a.

7 Dynkin's formulae **21**

8 Stopping times and martingales: reminder **22**

9 Poisson equation without a potential **22**
9.1 Introduction 22
9.2 Poisson equation (31) with a boundary 23
9.3 Poisson equation (31) without a boundary 25

10 Poisson equation with a potential **26**
10.1 Equation (32) 26
10.2 Further Dynkin's formulae 27
10.3 Poisson equation with a potential with a boundary 28
10.4 Poisson equation with a potential without a boundary 28
10.5 Convergence 28
10.6 u solves the equation 30
10.7 Uniqueness of solution 30

11 Ergodic Theorem, general case **31**

12 Coupling method: general version **35**

13 General coupling method for Markov chains **39**

1 Introduction

In these lecture notes we will consider the following issues: Ergodic theorem (in some textbooks called Convergence theorem, while Ergodic would be reserved for what we call Law of Large Numbers – see below), Law of Large Numbers (LLN), Central Limit Theorem (CLT), Large Deviations (LDs) for Markov chains, and as one of the most important applications, a Poisson equation. LLN, CLT and LDs are the basis of most of statistical applications. Everything is presented on the simplest model of a Markov chain with positive transition probabilities on a finite state space, and in some cases we show a few more general results where it does not require too much of additional efforts. This simplified version may be regarded as a preparation to more advanced situations of Markov chains on more general state space, including non-compact ones and including Markov diffusions. A special place in this plan is occupied by coupling method, a famous idea, which is not necessary for any result in these lecture notes; yet, it is a rather convenient tool "for thinking", although sometimes not very easy for a rigorous presentation. We show the Ergodic theorem firstly without and then with coupling method. Poisson equations in this paper are discrete analogues of "real" Poisson equations for elliptic differential operators of the second order in mathematical physics. We consider equations *without* a potential – the most useful tool in diffusion approximations, cf. [32, 12, 33] – and also *with* a potential. The problem of smoothness of solutions with respect to a parameter – which makes this stuff so important in diffusion approximations

and which is one of the main motivations of the whole theory – is not presented; however, these notes may be regarded as a bridge to this smoothness issue.

These notes are based on several different courses or crash cources delivered by the author at various universities in various years, including Moscow State, Helsinki Technical University (now Aalto), Leeds, and Higher School of Economics Moscow. The author thanks all participants – not only students – for their patience and for many useful remarks.

The initial plan involved non-compact cases with problems related to stability or recurrence properties of processes. However, this would require sigificantly more time and much more pages. Hence, this more ambitious task is postponed for some future.

Some classical results are given without proofs although they were proved in the courses delivered. The references on all such "missing" proofs are straightforward.

Finally, let us mention that the following numertion system is accepted here: all items such as Theorem, Lemma, Remark, Definition and some others are numbered by a unique sequence of natural numbers. The author believes that in a relatively small textbook type manuscript this is much more convenient than to numerate all Theorems, Lemmata et all by using separate numerators. At least, it makes easy the task to *find* any such item in the earlier or next sections if necessary. Since in the past the author spent some time to figure out how to arrange this numbering system in Latex "by hands", now let us mention a very easy way to do so automatically: just type in the preamble of the tex document the following, as an examplpe how to make a numeration unique for Theorems, Lemmata and, say, Remarks only:

```
\newtheorem{theorem}{Theorem}
\newtheorem{lemma}[theorem]{Lemma}
\newtheorem{remark}[theorem]{Remark}
```

In this way, after the Theorem 1, the following Lemma will have number 2, the next Remark will have number 3, etc. The author expects the readers to enjoy this numeration style.

The following notations will be used:

$$\mathcal{F}_n^X = \sigma(X_k : k \le n); \quad \mathcal{F}_{(n)}^X = \sigma(X_n).$$

2 Ergodic Theorem – 1

In this section we state and prove a simple ergodic theorem for Markov chains on a finite state space. However, we start with a more general setting because later in the end of these lecture notes a more general setting will be addressed. Ergodic Theorem for Markov chains in a simple situation of finite state spaces is due to Markov, although sometimes it is attributed to Kolmogorov with a reference to Gnedenko's textbook, and sometimes to Doeblin (see [15],

[9]). We emphasize that this approach was introduced by Markov himself (see [28, 36, 37]). Kolmogorov, indeed, has contributed to this area: see, in particular, [21].

Let us consider a homogeneous Markov chain $X = (X_n)$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ with a general topological state space $(S, \mathcal{S})$ where $\mathcal{S}$ is the family of all Borel sets in S assuming that $\mathcal{S}$ contains all single point subsets. Let $P_x(A)$ be the transition kernel, that is, $P_x(A) = P(X_1 \in A | X_0 = x)$; recall that for any $A \in \mathcal{S}$ this function is assumed Borel measurable in x (see [11]). Denote by $P_x(n, A)$ the n-step transition kernel; for finite Markov chain and if $A = j$, the notation $p_{ij}^{(n)}$ will be used, too. Recall the definition of ergodicity for Markov chains (MC).

Definition 1. *An MC (X_n) is called Markov ergodic iff the sequence of transition measures $(P_x(n, \cdot))$ has a limit in total variation metric, which is a probability measure and if, in addition, this limiting measure does not depend on x,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P_x(n, A) = \mu(A), \quad \forall\ A \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{1}$$

Definition 2. *An MC (X_n) is called irreducible iff for any $x \in S$ and $A \in \mathcal{S}$, $A \neq \emptyset$, there exists n such that*

$$P_x(X_n \in A) > 0.$$

An MC (X_n) is called ν-irreducible for a given measure ν on $(S, \mathcal{S})$ iff for any $x \in S$ and $A \in \mathcal{S}$, $\nu(A) > 0$ there exists n such that

$$P_x(X_n \in A) > 0.$$

Of course, weaker or stronger ergodicity properties (definitions) may be stated with weaker, or, respectively, stronger metrics. Yet, in the finite state space case most of them – but not all of them – are equivalent.

Exercise 3. *In the case of a finite state space $\mathcal{S}$ with $\mathcal{S} = 2^S$ (all subsets of S) and a* counting *measure ν such that $\nu(A) = |A| :=$ the number of elements in $A \subset S$, show that irreducibility of a MC is equivalent to the claim that there exists $n > 0$ such that the n-step transition probability matrix $\mathcal{P}^n$ is* **positive***, that is, all elements of it are strictly positive.*

The most standard is the notion of ν-irreducibility of an MC where ν is the unique invariant measure of the process.

Definition 4. *Stationary or invariant probability measure μ for a Markov process X is a measure on $\mathcal{S}$ such that for each $A \subset \mathcal{S}$ and any n,*

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{S}} \mu(x) P_x(n, A).$$

Lemma 5. *A probability measure μ is stationary for X iff*

$$\mu\mathcal{P} = \mu,$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ is the transition probability matrix of X.

Proof is straightforward by induction.

Lemma 6. *For any (homogeneous) Markov chain in a finite state space $\mathcal{S}$ there exists at least one stationary measure.*

Proof of Lemma 6. The method is due to Krylov and Bogoliubov (Kryloff and Bogoliuboff, [24]). Let us fix some (any) $i_0 \in S$, and consider Cesàro averages

$$\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n} p_{i_0,j}^{(k)}, \quad 1 \le j \le N, \quad n \ge 1.$$

Due to boundedness, this sequence of vectors as $n \to \infty$ has a limit over some subsequence, say, $n' \to \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{n'+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n'} p_{i_0,j}^{(k)} \to \pi_j, \quad 1 \le j \le N, \quad n' \to 1,$$

where by the standard convention, $p_{ij}^{(0)} = \delta_{ij}$ (Kronecker's symbol). Since S is finite, it follows that $(\pi_j,\, 1 \le j \le N)$ is a probability distribution on S. Finally, stationarity follows from the following calculus based on Chapman–Kolmogorov's equations,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n'+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n'} p_{i_0,j}^{(k)} &= \frac{1}{n'+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n'}\sum_{\ell=1}^{N} p_{i_0,\ell}^{(k-1)} p_{\ell,j} + \frac{1}{n'+1} p_{i_0,j}^{(0)} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} \frac{1}{n'+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n'-1} p_{i_0,\ell}^{(k)} p_{\ell,j} + \frac{1}{n'+1} p_{i_0,j}^{(0)} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} \frac{1}{n'+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n'} p_{i_0,\ell}^{(k)} p_{\ell,j} + \frac{1}{n'+1} p_{i_0,j}^{(0)} - \frac{1}{n'+1}\sum_{\ell=1}^{N} p_{i_0,\ell}^{(n')} p_{\ell,j}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows,

$$\lim_{n'\to\infty} \frac{1}{n'+1}\sum_{k=0}^{n'} p_{i_0,j}^{(k)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} \pi_\ell p_{\ell,j}.$$

Hence,

$$\pi_j = \sum_{\ell=1}^{N} \pi_j p_{\ell,j} \quad \sim \quad \pi = \pi\mathcal{P}.$$

This means that the disribution (π_j) is, indeed, stationary due to the Lemma 5. The Lemma 6 is proved.

Remark 7. *Note that for a finite $\mathcal{S}$ the statement of the Lemma, actually, may be proved much faster by applying the Brouwer fixed point theorem, as it is done, for example, in [39]. Yet, the method used in the proof seems deeper, and it can be used in a much more general situation including "non-compact" cases. (However, we are not saying that the use of Brouwer's fixed point theorem is restricted to finite state spaces.)*

From now on, in this and several following sections we consider the case of a finite state space S; a more general case will be addressed in the last sections. The next condition suggested by Markov himself plays a very important role in the analysis of asymptotic behavious of a (homogeneous) Markov chain (MC in the sequel). Let there exist n_0 such that

$$\kappa_{n_0} := \inf_{i,i'} \sum_j \min(P_i(n_0, j), P_{i'}(n_0, j)) \equiv \inf_{i,i'} \sum_j \min(p^{n_0}_{i,j}, p^{n_0}_{i',j}) > 0. \tag{2}$$

By the suggestion of S. Seneta, this coefficient κ_{n_0} (as well as κ_1 in (3) and κ below in (49)) is properly called Markov–Dobrushin's.

Unlike in the continuous time case, in discrete time situation there are potential complications related to possible *cycles*, that is, to a *periodic structure* of the process. A typical example of such a periodic structure is a situation where the state space is split into two parts, $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$, which do not intersect, and $X_{2n} \in \mathcal{S}_1$, while $X_{2n+1} \in \mathcal{S}_2$ for each n. Then ergodic properties is reasonable to study separately for $Y_n := X_{2n}$ and for $Z_n := X_{2n+1}$. In other words, this complication due to periodicity does not introduce any real news, and by this reason there is a tradition to avoid this situation. Hence, in the sequel we will study our ergodic process under the assumption $n_0 = 1$ in the condition (2). Similar results could be obtained under a more general assumption of *aperiodicity*.

So, here is the simplified version of (2), which will be acceped in the sequel:

$$\kappa := \inf_{i,i'} \sum_j \min(P_i(1, j), P_{i'}(1, j)) \equiv \inf_{i,i'} \sum_j \min(p_{ij}, p_{i'j}) > 0. \tag{3}$$

Also, to clarify the ideas we will be using in some cases the following stronger assumption,

$$\kappa_0 := \inf_{ij} p_{ij} > 0. \tag{4}$$

However, eventually, the assumption (4) will be dropped and only (3) will remain in use.

Theorem 8. *Let the assumption (3) hold true. Then the process (X_n) is ergodic, i.e., there exists a limiting probability measure μ such that (1) holds true. Moreover, the uniform bound is satisfied for every n,*

$$\sup_x \sup_{A \in \mathcal{S}} |P_x(n, A) - \mu(A)| \le (1 - \kappa)^n. \tag{5}$$

Proof of Theorem 8 is classical and may be found in many places, for example, in [15].

(A) Denote for any A,

$$m^{(n)}(A) := \min_i P_i(n, A), \quad M^{(n)}(A) := \max_i P_i(n, A).$$

By Chapman–Kolmogorov,

$$m^{(n+1)}(A) = \min_i P_i(n+1, A) = \min_i \sum_j p_{ij} P_j(n, A)$$

$$\geq \min_i \sum_j p_{ij} \min_{j'} P_{j'}(n, A) = m^n(A),$$

which signifies that the sequence $m^n(A)$ does not decrease in n. Similarly, the sequence $M^n(A)$ does not increase in n. Hence, it suffices to show that

$$M^{(n)}(A) - m^{(n)}(A) \leq (1-\kappa)^n. \tag{6}$$

(B) Again by Chapman–Kolmogorov,

$$M^n(A) - m^n(A) = \max_i P_i(n, A) - \min_{i'} P_{i'}(n, A)$$

$$= \max_i \sum_j p_{ij} P_j(n-1, A) - \min_{i'} \sum_j p_{i'j} P_j(n-1, A).$$

Let max here be attained at i_+ while min at i_-. Then,

$$M^n(A) - m^n(A) = \sum_j p_{i_+ j} P_j(n-1, A) - \sum_j p_{i_- j} P_j(n-1, A)$$

$$= \sum_j (p_{i_+ j} - p_{i_- j}) P_j(n-1, A). \tag{7}$$

(C) Denote by S^+ the part of the sum in the right hand side of (7) with just $(p_{i_+ j} - p_{i_- j}) \geq 0$, and by S^- the part of the sum with $(p_{i_+ j} - p_{i_- j}) < 0$. We estimate,

$$S^+ \leq \sum_j (p_{i_+ j} - p_{i_- j})_+ M^{(n-1)}(A),$$

and

$$S^- \leq -\sum_j (p_{i_+ j} - p_{i_- j})_- m^{(n-1)}(A).$$

Therefore,

$$M^{(n)}(A) - m^{(n)}(A) = S^+ + S^-$$

$$\leq M^{(n-1)}(A) \sum_j (p_{i_+ j} - p_{i_- j})_+ + m^{(n-1)}(A) \sum_j (p_{i_+ j} - p_{i_- j})_-.$$

(D) It remains to notice that

$$\sum_j (p_{i_+j} - p_{i_-j})_- = -\sum_j (p_{i_+j} - p_{i_-j})_+,$$

and

$$\sum_j (p_{i_+j} - p_{i_-j})_+ \le 1 - \kappa. \tag{8}$$

The first follows from the normalization condition

$$\sum_j p_{i_+j} = \sum_j p_{i_-j} = 1,$$

while the second from

$$\sum_j (p_{i_+j} - p_{i_-j})_+ = \sum_j (p_{i_+j} - \min(p_{i_-j}, p_{i_+j})) \le 1 - \kappa.$$

So, we find that

$$M^{(n)}(A) - m^{(n)}(A) \le (1-\kappa)\,(M^{(n-1)}(A) - m^{(n-1)}(A)).$$

By induction this implies (6). So, (5) as well as uniqueness of the limits $\pi_j = \lim_{n\to\infty} p_{ij}^{(n)}$ follow. Uniqueness of stationary measure, in turn, follows from (5): start from "another" stationary distribution μ, then $\mu_j \equiv P_\mu(X_n = j) = \sum_\ell \mu_\ell p_{ij}^{(n)} \to \pi_j,\ n \to \infty$; hence, $\mu_j = \pi_j$. The Theorem 8 is proved.

Recall that the **total variation distance** or metric between two probability measures may be defined as

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} := 2 \sup_A (\mu(A) - \nu(A)).$$

Hence, the inequality (5) may be rewritten as

$$\sup_x \|P_x(n,\cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \le 2(1-\kappa)^n. \tag{9}$$

Corollary 9. *Under the assumption of the Theorem 8, for any bounded Borel function f,*

$$\sup_x |\mathbb{E}_x f(X_t)|X_s) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_t)| \equiv \sup_x |\mathbb{E}_x (f(X_t) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_t)|X_s)| \le C_f (1-\kappa)^{t-s},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\sup_x |\mathbb{E}_x f(X_t)|\mathcal{F}_s^X) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_t)| \le C_f (1-\kappa)^{t-s},$$

where $C_f = \max_j |f(j)| \equiv \|f\|_{B(\mathcal{S})}$.

This Corollary follows from the Theorem 8 immediately, and this is what will be, actually, used in the sequel.

It is worth noting that in a general case there is a significantly weaker condition than (2) (or, in the general case weaker than (49) – see below in the section 11), which also guarantees an exponential convergence rate to a unique invariant measure. We will show this condition – called Doeblin-Doob's one – and state the corresponding famous Doeblin–Doob's theorem on convergence, but for proofs refer to [10].

Definition 10 (DD-condition)**.** *There exist a finite (sigma-additive) measure* $\nu \geq 0$ *and* $\epsilon > 0$, $s > 0$ *such that* $\nu(A) \leq \epsilon$ *implies*

$$\sup_x P_x(s, A) \leq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Theorem 11 (Doeblin–Doob, without proof)**.** *If the DD-condition is satisfied for an* aperiodic MP with a unique class of ergodicity (see [10]) *on the state space* $\mathcal{S}$*, then there exist* $C, c > 0$ *such that*

$$\sup_x \sup_{A \in \mathcal{S}} |P_x(n, A) - \mu(A)| \leq C \exp(-cn), \quad n \geq 0. \tag{10}$$

It turns out that under the assumption (DD), the constants in the upper bound (10) *cannot be effectively computed*, i.e., they may be arbitrary even for the same ϵ and ν, say. This situation dramatically differs from the case of conditions (4) and (3), where both constants in the upper bound are effectively and explicitly evaluated.

Open Question 12. *It is interesting whether or not there may exist any intermediate situation with a bound like (10) – in particular, it should be uniform in the initial state – with* computable *constants* C, c *under an assumption lying somewhere in "between" Markov–Dobrushin's and Doeblin–Doob's. Apparently, such a condition may be artificially constructed from a "non–compact" theory with an exponential recurrence, but then the bounds would not be uniform in the initial data.*

3 LLN for homogeneous MC, finite S

It may seem as if the Ergodic Theorem with uniform exponentail convergence rate in total variation metric were all we could wish about ergodic features of the process. Yet, the statement of this theorem itself even does not include the Law of Large Numbers (LLN), which is not emphasized in most of the text books. However, the situation with LLN (as well as with Central Limit Theorem – CLT) is good enough, which is demostrated below. The Theorem 13 under the assumption (4) belongs to A.A. Markov, see [28, 36].

Theorem 13 (Weak LLN)**.** *Under the assumptions of the Theorem 8, for any function* f *on a finite state space* S*,*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0), \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{inv}$ *stands for the expectation of* $f(X_0)$ *with respect to the invariant probability measure of the process, while* $\mathbb{P}$ *denotes the measure, which corresponds to the initial vallue or distribution of* X_0*: the latter may be, or may be not stationary.*

Proof of the Theorem 13. **1**. First of all, note that (11) is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (f(X_k) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0)) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0,$$

so, without losing a generality we may and will assume that $\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) = 0$. Now we estimate with any $\epsilon > 0$ by the Bienaimé–Chebyshev–Markov inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k)| > \epsilon\right) \le \epsilon^{-2} n^{-2} \mathbb{E}|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k)|^2$$

$$= \epsilon^{-2} n^{-2} \mathbb{E}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f^2(X_k) + 2\epsilon^{-2} n^{-2} \mathbb{E}\sum_{k<j} f(X_k) f(X_j). \tag{12}$$

Here the first term clearly (as f is bounded) satisfies,

$$\epsilon^{-2} n^{-2} \mathbb{E}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f^2(X_k) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$

Let us transform the second term as follows for $k < j$:

$$\mathbb{E} f(X_k) f(X_j) = \mathbb{E}(f(X_k)(\mathbb{E}(f(X_j)|X_k)),$$

and recall that due to the Corollary 9 to the Ergodic theorem,

$$|\mathbb{E}(f(X_j)|X_k) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_j)| \le C_f (1-\kappa)^{j-k},$$

where due to our convention $\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_j) = 0$. Therefore, we have,

$$|\mathbb{E}\sum_{k<j} f(X_k) f(X_j)| = |\mathbb{E}\sum_{k<j} f(X_k)(\mathbb{E}(f(X_j)|X_k)|$$

$$\le C_f \sum_{k,j:\, 0\le k<j<n} (1-\kappa)^{j-k} \le Cn, \quad \text{with } C = C_f (1-\kappa)^{-1}.$$

Thus, the second term in (12) also goes to zero as $n \to \infty$. The Theorem 13 is proved.

Remark 14. *Recall that f is bounded and exponental rate of convergence is guaranteed. This suffices for a strong LLN via higher moments for sums. However, it will not be used in the sequel, so we do not show it here.*

4 CLT, finite S

In this section state space S is also finite. For the function f on S, let

$$\sigma^2 := \mathbb{E}_{inv}(f(X_0) - E_{inv} f(X_0))^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{inv}(f(X_0) - E_{inv} f(X_0))(f(X_k) - E_{inv} f(X_k)). \tag{13}$$

It is known that this definition provides a non-negative value (for completeness, see the two lemmata below).

Lemma 15. *Under our standing assumptions ($\mathcal{S}$ is finite and $\min_{ij} p_{ij} > 0$),*

$$\sigma^2 \geq 0, \tag{14}$$

and, moreover,

$$n^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{inv}(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} f(X_r))^2 \to \sigma^2, \quad n \to \infty, \tag{15}$$

where the latter convergence is irrespectively of whether $\sigma^2 > 0$, or $\sigma^2 = 0$.

Proof. For simplicity of the calculus and without losing of generality, we may and will assume now that $\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) = 0$ (otherwise, this mean value can be subtracted from f). Note also that the variance of η_1 computed **with respect to the invariant measure** coincides in this case with its second moment, and the latter may be evaluated as follows,

$$n^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{inv}(\sum_{r=0}^{n-1} f(X_r))^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{inv} f^2(X_0) + 2n^{-1}\sum_{i,j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_i) f(X_j)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{inv} f^2(X_0) + 2n^{-1}\sum_{r=1}^{n-1} (n-r)\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) f(X_r)$$

$$\stackrel{\text{clearly}}{\to} \mathbb{E}_{inv} f^2(X_0) + 2\sum_{}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) f(X_k) = \sigma^2, \quad n \to \infty.$$

Since the left hand side here is non-negative, the limit is non-negative, too, as required. The Lemma is proved.

Lemma 16. $\sigma^2 < \infty$.

Proof. Again, without losing a generality, we may and will assume $\bar{f} := \sum_x f(x)\mu(x) = 0$, and $\|f\|_B \leq 1$. We have, due to the Corollary 9,

$$|\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) f(X_k)| = |\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0)\mathbb{E}_{inv}(f(X_k)|X_0)| \leq \mathbb{E}_{inv}|f(X_0)|q^k,$$

with some $0 \leq q < 1$. So, the series in (13) does converge, as required. The Lemma is proved.

Theorem 17. *Let the assumption (3) hold true. Then for any function f on S,*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(f(X_k) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0)) \stackrel{\mathbb{P}}{\Longrightarrow} \eta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), \tag{16}$$

where $\Longrightarrow$ stands for the weak convergence with respect to the original probability measure (i.e., generally speaking, non-invariant).

Emphasize that we subtract the expectation with respect to the invariant measure, while weak convergence holds true with respect to the initial measure, which is not necessarily invariant. (We could subtract the actual expectation, too; the difference would be negligible due to the Corollary 9.)

Remark 18. *About Markov's method in CLT the reader may consult the textbook [39]. Various approaches can be found in [1, 2] , [21], [10], [29, 30], [36], et al. For a historical review see [37]. A nontrivial issue of distinguishing the cases* $\sigma^2 > 0$ *and* $\sigma^2 = 0$ *for stationary Markov chains is under discussion in [3] for finite MC where a criterion has been established for* $\sigma^2 = 0$*; this criterion was extended to more general cases in [22]. A simple example of irreducible aperiodic MC (with* $\inf_{ij} p_{ij} = 0$*) and a non-constant function* f *where* $\sigma^2 = 0$ *can be found in [39, ch. 6]. Nevertheless, there is a general belief that "normally" in "most of cases"* $\sigma^2 > 0$*. (Recall that zero (a constant) is regarded as a degenerate Gaussian random variable* $\mathcal{N}(0, 0)$*.) On assumptions in terms of weaker norms in CLT for Markov chains see [26].*

Proof of Theorem 17. Without losing a generality, assume that $\|f\|_B \le 1$, and

$$\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) = 0.$$

I. Firstly, consider the case $\sigma^2 > 0$. We are going to use Bernstein's method of "corridors and windows". Let us split the interval $[0, n]$ into partitions of two types: larger ones called "corridors" and smaller ones called "windows". Their sizes will increase with n as follows. Let $k := [n/[n^{3/4}]]$ be the total number of long corridors of equal length (here $[a]$ is the intereger part of $a \in \mathbb{R}$); this length will be chosen shortly as equivalent to $n^{3/4}$. The length of each window is $w := [n^{1/5}]$. Now, the length of each corridor except the last one is $c := [n/k] - w \equiv [n/k] - [n^{1/5}]$; the last complementary corridor has the length $c_L := n - k[n/k]$; note that $c_L \le [n/k] \sim n^{3/4}$, $k \sim n^{1/4}$ (i.e., $k/n^{1/4} \to 1$, $n \to \infty$), and $c \sim n^{3/4}$.

The total length of all windows is then equivalent to $w \times k \sim n^{1/5+1/4} = n^{9/20}$; note for the sequel that $n^{9/20} << n^{1/2}$. As was mentioned earlier, the length of the last corridor does not exceed k, and, hence, asymptotically is no more than $n^{1/4}$ (which is much less than the length of any other corridor).

Now, denote all partial sums $\sum_{r=0}^{n} f(X_r)$ over first k corridors by η_j, $1 \le j \le k$. In particular,

$$\eta_1 = \sum_{r=0}^{c-1} f(X_r), \quad \eta_2 = \sum_{r=c+w}^{2c+w-1} f(X_r), \ \text{ etc.}$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |\sum_{r=0}^{n} f(X_r) - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \eta_j| \le C_f \frac{(wk+k)}{\sqrt{n}} \sim C_f \frac{n^{9/20} + n^{1/4}}{\sqrt{n}} \to 0, \quad n \to \infty,$$

uniformly in $\omega \in \Omega$. Hence, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \eta_j \Longrightarrow \eta' \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2).$$

Note that

$$n^{-1}\mathbb{E}_{inv}\eta_1^2 \sim \frac{c}{n}\sigma^2, \quad n \to \infty,$$

or,

$$n^{-3/4}\mathbb{E}_{inv}\eta_1^2 \to \sigma^2, \quad n \to \infty, \tag{17}$$

and the latter convergence is irrespectively of whether $\sigma^2 > 0$, or $\sigma^2 = 0$.

Now, to show the desired weak convergence, let us check the behaviour of the characteristic functions. Due to the Corollary 9, we estimate for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|\mathbb{E}(\exp(i\lambda\eta_j)|\mathcal{F}^X_{(j-1)[n/k]}) - \mathbb{E}_{inv}(\exp(i\lambda\eta_j)| \le C(1-\kappa)^{[n^{1/5}]}.$$

So, by induction,

$$\mathbb{E}\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\eta_j)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\eta_j)\mathbb{E}(\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_{k+1})|\mathcal{F}^X_{k[n/k]})$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{k}\eta_j)(\mathbb{E}_{inv}(\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_{k+1}) + O((1-\kappa)^{n^{1/5}}))$$

$$= \ldots = \mathbb{E}_{inv}(\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_{k+1} + O((1-\kappa)^{n^{1/5}}))(\mathbb{E}_{inv}(\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_1))^k + O(k(1-\kappa)^{n^{1/5}})).$$

Here $O(k(1-\kappa)^{n^{1/5}})$ is, generally speaking, random and it is a function of $X_{k[n/k]}$, but the module of this random variable does not exceed a nonrandom constant multiplied by $k(1-\kappa)^{n^{1/5}}$. We replaced $[n^{1/5}]$ by $n^{1/5}$, which does not change the asymptotic (in)equality. Note that

$$O(k(1-\kappa)^{n^{1/5}})) = O(n^{3/4}(1-\kappa)^{n^{1/5}})) \to 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$

Now the idea is to use Taylor's expansion

$$\mathbb{E}_{inv}\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_1) = 1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2n}n^{3/4}\sigma^2 + R_n = 1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2n^{1/4}}\sigma^2 + R_n.$$

Here, to provie the desired statement it suffices to estimate accurately the remainder term R_n, that is, to show that $R_n = o(n^{-1/4})$, $n \to \infty$.

Since we, actually, transferred the problem to studying an array scheme (as η_1 itself changes with n), we have to inspect carefully this remainder R_n. Due to the Taylor expansion we have,

$$\operatorname{Re}\varphi(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}) = \mathbb{E}_{inv}\cos(\frac{\lambda\eta_1}{\sqrt{n}}) = 1 + 0\times\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}} + \cos''(0)\frac{\lambda^2}{2n}\mathbb{E}_{inv}\eta_1^2 + \frac{\hat{\lambda}^3}{6\sqrt{n^3}}\mathbb{E}_{inv}\eta_1^3\cos'''(\hat{\lambda}\eta_1),$$

with some $\hat{\lambda}\in[0,\lambda]$ if $\lambda\geq 0$, or $\hat{\lambda}\in[\lambda,0]$ if $\lambda<0$, and similarly,

$$\operatorname{Im}\varphi(\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}) = \mathbb{E}_{inv}\sin(\frac{\lambda\eta_1}{\sqrt{n}}) = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}^3}{6\sqrt{n^3}}\mathbb{E}_{inv}\eta_1^3\sin'''(\tilde{\lambda}\eta_1),\quad \tilde{\lambda}\in[0,\lambda],\ \text{ or }\ \tilde{\lambda}\in[\lambda,0].$$

Here in general $\hat{\lambda}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}$ may differ. However, this is not important in our calculus because in any case $|\tilde{\lambda}|\leq|\lambda|$ and $|\hat{\lambda}|\leq|\lambda|$. All we need to do now is to justify a bound

$$|\mathbb{E}_{inv}\eta_1^3|\leq Kc. \tag{18}$$

This is a rather standard estimation and we show the details only for completeness. It suffices to consider the case $C_f\leq 1$, which restriction we assume without losing a generality.

a. Consider the case $\mathbb{E}f(X_k)^3$. We have, clearly,

$$|\sum_{k=1}^{c}\mathbb{E}f(X_k)^3|\leq c.$$

b. Consider the case $\mathbb{E}X_jX_kX_\ell$, $\ell>k>j$. We have,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c}\mathbb{E}X_jX_kX_\ell = \sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c}\mathbb{E}X_jX_kE(X_\ell|X_k)$$

$$=\sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c}\mathbb{E}X_jX_k\psi_{k,\ell}q^{\ell-k}\quad(\text{here }\psi_{k,\ell}\in\mathcal{F}^X_{(k)}\equiv\sigma(X_k)\text{ and }|\psi_{k,\ell}|\leq 1).$$

Note that, with a $0\leq q<1$, the expression

$$\zeta_k := \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c-1}\psi_{k,\ell}q^{\ell-k}$$

is a random variable, which module is bounded by the absolute constant $(1-q)^{-1}$ and which is $\mathcal{F}^X_{(k)}$-measurable, i.e., it may be represented as some (Borel) function of X_k. So, we continue the calculus,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c}\mathbb{E}X_jX_kX_\ell = \sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c}\mathbb{E}X_jX_k\zeta_k = \sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c}\mathbb{E}X_jE(X_k\zeta_k|X_j)$$

$$=\sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\mathbb{E}X_j(\mathbb{E}X_k\zeta_k+\zeta'_{k,j}q^{k-j}) = \sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\mathbb{E}X_j\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\zeta'_{k,j}q^{k-j} = \sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\mathbb{E}X_j\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\zeta'_{k,j}q^{k-j},$$

due to $\mathbb{E}X_j\mathbb{E}X_k\zeta_k = 0$, since $\mathbb{E}X_j = 0$. Here $\zeta'_{k,j}$, in turn, for each k does not exceed by modulus the value $(1-q)^{-1}$ and is $\mathcal{F}^X_{(j)}$-measurable. Therefore, the inner sum in the last expression satisfies,

$$|\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\zeta'_{k,j}q^{k-j}| \le \sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}|\zeta'_{k,j}|q^{k-j} \le (1-q)^{-1}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}q^{k-j} \le (1-q)^{-2}.$$

Thus,

$$|\sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\sum_{k=j+1}^{c-1}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{c}\mathbb{E}X_jX_kX_\ell| \le (1-q)^{-2}\sum_{j=0}^{c-2}\mathbb{E}|X_j| \le c(1-q)^{-2},$$

as required.

c. Consider the terms with $\mathbb{E}f(X_k)^2f(X_\ell)$, $\ell > k$. We estimate, with some (random) $|\psi'_{\ell,k}| \le 1$ and $0 \le q < 1$,

$$|\sum_{k<\ell}^{c-1}\mathbb{E}f(X_k)^2\mathbb{E}(f(X_\ell)|X_k)| = |\sum_{k<\ell}\mathbb{E}f(X_k)^2\psi'_{\ell,k}q^{\ell-k}| \le \frac{c}{1-q}.$$

d. Consider the case $\mathbb{E}f(X_k)^2f(X_\ell)$, $\ell < k$. We have similarly, for $\ell < k$,

$$EX_k^2X_\ell = EX_\ell E(X_k^2|X_\ell) = EX_\ell(E(X_k^2 + \psi_{\ell,k}q^{k-\ell}), \quad |\psi_{\ell,k}| \le 1.$$

So, again,

$$|\sum_{\ell<k}^{c-1}\mathbb{E}f(X_\ell)\mathbb{E}(f(X_k)^2|X_\ell)| = |\sum_{\ell<k<c-1}\mathbb{E}f(X_k)^2\psi'_{\ell,k}q^{k-\ell}| \le \frac{c}{1-q}.$$

e. Finally, collecting all intermediate bounds we obtain the bound (18), as required:

$$|\mathbb{E}\eta_1^3| \le Kc.$$

This would imply the esimate for the remainder term like

$$\frac{c}{n^{3/2}} \sim n^{3/4-3/2} = n^{-3/4}.$$

The last detail is to consider the last multiplier, for which we have $\sigma_{k+1}^2 := \mathbb{E}\eta_{k+1}^2$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}_{inv}\eta_{k+1}^2 = O(n^{3/4}\sigma^2), \quad n \to \infty, \tag{19}$$

which may be tackled similarly to all others, for which, in any case, we get the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_{inv}\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\eta_{k+1}) = 1 + o(1)), \quad n \to \infty.$$

Hence, we eventually get,

$$E\exp(i\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{r=0}^{n} f(X_r)) = (1-\frac{\lambda^2 c}{2n}+\frac{c}{n^{3/2}})^{n^{1/4}} \approx (1-\frac{\lambda^2\sigma^2}{2n^{1/4}}+\frac{1}{n^{3/4}})^{n^{1/4}} \to \exp(-\lambda^2\sigma^2/2),$$

which is the characteristic function for the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)$, as required.

II. The case $\sigma^2 = 0$ is considered absolutely similarly. Hence, the Theorem is proved.

5 Coupling method for Markov chain: simple version

Concerning coupling method, it is difficult to say who exactly invented this method. The common view – shared by the author of these lecture notes – is that it was introduced by W. Doeblin [9], even though he himself refers to some ideas of Kolmogorov with relaton to the study of ergodic properties of Markov chains. Leaving this subject to the historians of mathematics, let us just mention that there are quite a few articles and monographs with this method is presented [16], [31], [27], [38], et al. Also there many papers and books where this or close method is used for further investigations without being explicitly named, see, e.g., [4]. This method itself provides "another way" to establish geometric convergence in the Egodic theorem. ln the simple form as in this section this method has limited applications; however, in a more elaborated version – see the section 13 below – it is most useful, and applicable to a large variety of Markov processes including rather general diffusions, providing not necessarily geometric rates of convergence but also much weaker in non-compact spaces.

The simplest Markov chain is just one random variable where time takes only one value. By simple coupling for two random variables X^1, X^2 (hence, actually, for two simplest Markov chains) we understand the situation where both X^1, X^2 are defined on the same probbility space and

$$P(X^1 = X^2) > 0.$$

Now let us turn to more interesting Markov chains with time changing from zero to infinity: $(X_n,\, n = 0, 1, \ldots)$. In fact, this simple "Doeblin's" version of coupling provides bounds of convergence, which are far from optimal. (By "far from optimal" we understand that the constant under the exponential is too rough.) Yet, its advantage is its simplicity and, in particuar, no change of the initial probability space. From the beginning we need two "independent" probability spaces, $(\Omega^1, \mathcal{F}^1, \mathbb{P}^1)$, and $(\Omega^2, \mathcal{F}^2, \mathbb{P}^2)$, and the whole construction runs on the direct product of those two:

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) := (\Omega^1, \mathcal{F}^1, \mathbb{P}^1) \times (\Omega^2, \mathcal{F}^2, \mathbb{P}^2).$$

This space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ will remain unchainged in this section. We assume that there are two Markov processes (X_n^1) on $(\Omega^1, \mathcal{F}^1, \mathbb{P}^1)$ and (X_n^2) on $(\Omega^2, \mathcal{F}^2, \mathbb{P}^2)$, correspondingly, with the same transition probability matrix $\mathcal{P} = (p_{ij})_{i,j\in\mathcal{S}}$ satisfying the "simple ergodic assumption",

$$\kappa_0 := \inf_{i,j} p_{ij} > 0. \tag{20}$$

Naturally, both processes are defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ as follows,

$$X_n^1(\omega) = X_n^1(\omega^1, \omega^2) := X_n^1(\omega^1), \quad \& \quad X_n^2(\omega) = X_n^2(\omega^1, \omega^2) := X_n^2(\omega^2).$$

We will need some (well-known) auxiliary results. Recall that given a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)$, stopping time is any random variable $\tau < \infty$ a.s. with values in $\mathbb{Z}_+$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$(\omega : \tau > n) \in \mathcal{F}_n.$$

In any textbook on Markov chains the following Lemma may be found (see, e.g., [47]).

Lemma 19. *Any Markov chain (i.e., a Markov process with discrete time) is strong Markov.*

Consider a new process composed from two, $X_n := (X_n^1, X_n^2)$, evidently, with two independent coordinates. Due to this independence, the following Lemma holds true.

Lemma 20. *The (vector-valued) process (X_n) is a (homogeneous) Markov chain; hence, this chain is also strong Markov.*

In the following main result of this section, μ stands for the (unique) stationary distribution of our Markov chain (X_n^1) (as well as of (X_n^2)).

Theorem 21. *For any initial distribution μ_0,*

$$\sup_A |\mathbb{P}_\mu(n, A) - \mu(A)| \le (1 - \kappa_0)^n. \tag{21}$$

Let us emphasize again that the bound is not optimal; however, the advantage is that the construction of coupling here does not require any change of the probability space.

Proof of Theorem 21. Recall that a new Markov chain $X_n := (X_n^1, X_n^2)$ with two independent coordinates is strong Markov. Let

$$\tau := \inf(n \ge 0 : \ X_n^1 = X_n^2).$$

We have seen that $\mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) = 1$. More than that, from Markov property it follows for any n by induction,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau > n) = \mathbb{E}1(\tau > n) = \mathbb{E}\prod_{k=1}^{n} 1(\tau > k)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{E}(\prod_{k=1}^{n} 1(\tau > k)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \mathbb{E}\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} 1(\tau > k)\mathbb{E}(1(\tau > n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})$$

$$\le \mathbb{E}\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} 1(\tau > k)(1 - \kappa_0) = (1 - \kappa_0)\mathbb{E}\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} 1(\tau > k) \le^{(\text{induction})} \cdots \le (1 - \kappa_0)^n. \tag{22}$$

Define

$$X_n^3 := X_n^1 1(n < \tau) + X_n^2 1(n \ge \tau).$$

Due to the strong Markov property, (X^3) is also a *Markov chain* and it is *equivalent* to (X^1) – that is, they both have the same distribution in the space of trajectories. This follows straightforward from the fact that at τ which is a stopping time the processes follows X^2, so that it uses the same transition probabilities while choosing the next state at $\tau+1$ and further.

Now, here is the most standard and most frequent calculus in most of works on coupling method, or where this method is used (recall that all the processes X^1, X^2, X^3 are defined on the same probability space): for any $A \subset \mathcal{S}$,

$$|\mathbb{P}(X_n^1 \in A) - \mathbb{P}(X_n^2 \in A)| = |\mathbb{P}(X_n^3 \in A) - \mathbb{P}(X_n^2 \in A)|$$

$$= |\mathbb{E}1(X_n^1 \in A) - \mathbb{E}1(X_n^2(A)| = |\mathbb{E}(1(X_n^3(A) - 1(X_n^2 \in A))|$$

$$= |\mathbb{E}(1(X_n^3 \in A) - 1(X_n^2 \in A))1(\tau > n) + \mathbb{E}(1(X_n^3 \in A) - 1(X_n^2 \in A))1(\tau \le n)|$$

$$\stackrel{(*)}{=} |\mathbb{E}(1(X_n^3 \in A) - 1(X_n^2 \in A))1(\tau > n)| \le |\mathbb{E}(1(X_n^3 \in A) - 1(X_n^2 \in A))1(\tau > n)|$$

$$\le \mathbb{E}|1(X_n^3 \in A) - 1(X_n^2 \in A)|1(\tau > n) \le \mathbb{E}1(\tau > n) = \mathbb{P}(\tau > n) \stackrel{(22)}{\le} (1-\kappa_0)^n.$$

Note that the final bound is uniform in A. Here the equality (*) is due to the trivial fact that since $n \ge \tau$, the values of X_n^3 and X_n^2 coincide, so either $1(X_n^3 \in A) = 1(X_n^2 \in A) = 0$, or $1(X_n^3 \in A) = 1(X_n^2 \in A) = 1$ simultaneously on each ω, which immediately implies that $(1(X_n^3 \in A) - 1(X_n^2 \in A))1(\tau \le n) = 0$. So, the Theorem 21 is proved.

6 A bit of large deviations

In this section assume

$$\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) = 0.$$

We will be interested in the existence and properties of the limit,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}_x \exp(\beta \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k)) =: H(\beta). \tag{23}$$

Denote

$$H_n(\beta, x) := \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E}_x \exp(\beta \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k)),$$

and define the operator $T = T^\beta$ acting on functions on $\mathcal{S}$ as follows,

$$T^\beta h(x) := \exp(\beta f(x)) \mathbb{E}_x h(X_1).$$

Note that due to the Markov property the function H_n can be rewritten as

$$H_n(\beta, x) = \frac{1}{n} \ln (T^\beta)^n h(x).$$

It is an easy exercise to check that the function $H_n(\beta, x)$ is convex in β. Hence, if the limit exists, then the limiting function H is also convex. Now recall the following classical and basic result about positive matrices.

Theorem 22 (Perron–Frobenius)**.** *For any positive quadratic matix (i.e., with all entries positive) there is a positive eigenvalue r called its spectral radius, which is strictly greater than the moduli of the rest of the spectrum, this eigenvalue is simple, and its corresponding eigenfunction (eigenvector) has all positive coordintes.*

In fact, this result is due to Perron, while Frobenius extended it to non-negative matrices. We do not discuss the difference. Various presentations may be found, in particular, in [36], [19], [23]. As an easy corollary, the Theorem 22 implies the existence of the limit in (23) with,

$$H(\beta) = \ln r(\beta), \tag{24}$$

where $r(\beta)$ is the spectral radius of the operator T^β, see, for example, [14, Theorem 7.4.2]. More than that, in our case it follows from the theorem about analytic properties of simple eigenvalues $r(\beta)$ is analytic, see, e.g., [20]. Therefore, $H(\beta)$ is analytic, too. Also, clearly, analytic is H_n as a function of the variable β. Then it follows from the properties of analytic (or convex) functions that convergence $H_n(\beta, x) \to H(\beta)$ implies that also

$$H_n'(0, x) \to H'(0), \quad n \to \infty.$$

On the other hand, due to the Law of Large Numbers,

$$H_n'(0) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_x \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k) \to \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$H'(0) = \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) = 0.$$

Also, again due to the analyticity,

$$H_n''(0, x) \to H''(0), \quad n \to \infty.$$

On the other hand, due to (13) and (17),

$$H_n''(0) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_x (\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k))^2 \to \sigma^2, \quad n \to \infty.$$

Hence,

$$H''(0) = \sigma^2.$$

This last assertion will not be used in the sequel.

Let us state it all as a lemma.

Lemma 23. *There exists a limit $H(\beta)$ in (23). This function H is convex and differentiable, and, in particular,*

$$H'(0) = 0, \quad H''(0) = \sigma^2.$$

Actually, we will not use *large deviations* (LDs) in these lecture notes, except for the Lemma 23, which is often regarded as a preliminary auxiliary result in large deviation theory. Yet, once the title of the section uses this term, let us state one simple inequality of LD type.

Recall that $\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) = 0$ in this section.

Proposition 24. *Let*

$$L(\alpha) := \sup_{\beta}(\alpha\beta - H(\beta)), \quad \tilde{L}(\alpha) := \limsup_{\delta \to 0} L(\alpha + \delta). \tag{25}$$

Then under the assumptions of the Ergodic Theorem 8 for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln P_x(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k) \geq \epsilon) \leq -\tilde{L}(\epsilon). \tag{26}$$

The function L is called Legendre transformation of the function H. It is convex and lower semicontinuous; see [35] about this and more general transformations (e.g., where H is convex but not necessarily smooth – in which case L is called Fenchel–Legendre's transformation). Notice that "usually" in (26) there is a limit instead of lim sup, and this limit equals the right hand side, and both $\tilde{L}(\epsilon) = L(\epsilon) > 0$; the latter is certainly true, at least, for small $\epsilon > 0$ if $\sigma^2 > 0$. However, this simple result does not pretend to be even an introduction to large deviations, about which theory see [14], [40], [7], [13], [17], [34], [5], et al. In the next sections the Proposition 24 will not be used: all we will need is the limit in (23) due to the Lemma 23 and some its properties, which will be specified.

Proof of Proposition 24. Both inequalities follow similarly; hence, consider the first one. We have for any $0 < \delta < \epsilon$, by Chebyshev–Markov's exponential inequality with any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k) \geq \epsilon) = \mathbb{P}_x(\exp(\lambda\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k)) \geq \exp(n\lambda\epsilon))$$

$$\leq \exp(-n\lambda\epsilon)\mathbb{E}_x \exp(\lambda\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k)) \overset{(23)}{\leq} \exp(-n(\lambda(\epsilon-\delta) + H(\lambda)),$$

if n is large enough. It immediately follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(X_k) \geq \epsilon) \leq \exp(-n\sup_{\lambda>0}(\lambda(\epsilon-\delta) + H(\lambda)),$$

However, since $H(0) = 0$ and $H'(0) = 0$, the supremum on *all* $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ here is attained on $\lambda > 0$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{\lambda>0}(\lambda(\epsilon-\delta) + H(\lambda)) = \sup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}}(\lambda(\epsilon-\delta) + H(\lambda)) \equiv L(\epsilon-\delta).$$

Thus, the left hand side in (26) does not exceed $-\limsup_{\delta\downarrow 0} L(\epsilon-\delta) \leq -\tilde{L}(\epsilon)$, as required. The Proposition 24 is proved.

7 Dynkin's formulae

Let L be a generator of some Markov chain on a finite state space $\mathcal{S}$, which satisfies the Ergodic Theorem 8, that is, for any function u on $\mathcal{S}$,

$$Lu := \mathbb{E}_x u(X_1) - u(x). \tag{27}$$

We recall that such operators are discrete analogues of elliptic differential operators of the second order, studied extensively, in particular, in mathematiical physics. The Poisson equation for the operator L from (27) is the following:

$$Lu(x) = -f(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{28}$$

It may be studied *with* or *without* some boundary and certain boundary conditions. The goal of this chapter is to present how such equations may be solved probabilistically. This simple study may be also considered as an introduction to the more standard Poisson equations for elliptic differential operators.

We start with the main **Dynkin's formula** or Dynkin's identity.

Theorem 25 (Dynkin's formula 1)**.** *On the finite state space $\mathcal{S}$, for any function h and any $n = 1, 2, \ldots$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_x h(X_n) = h(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_x Lh(X_k), \quad n \geq 0. \tag{29}$$

Proof. **1.** For $n = 1$ the formula (29) reads,

$$\mathbb{E}_x h(X_1) = h(x) + (\mathbb{E}_x) Lh(x),$$

where x is a non-random initial value of the process; here we put $\mathbb{E}_x$ in brackets to emphasize that for a non-random value its expectation equals this value, i.e., the sign of expectation is, in fact, not required. Hence, the desired identity for $n = 1$ is equivalent to the definition of the generator in (27).

2. For the general case n, the desired formula follows by induction. Indeed, assume that the formula (29) holds true for some $n = k$ and check it for $n = k + 1$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_x h(X_{n+1}) &= \mathbb{E}_x h(X_{n+1}) - \mathbb{E}_x h(X_n) + \mathbb{E}_x h(X_n) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_x \mathbb{E}_x (h(X_{n+1}) - h(X_n) | X_n) + \mathbb{E}_x h(X_n) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_x \mathbb{E}_x (Lh(X_n) | X_n) + h(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_x Lh(X_k) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_x Lh(X_n) + h(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_x Lh(X_k) = h(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n} \mathbb{E}_x Lh(X_k).
\end{aligned}$$

So, the formula (29) for all values of n follows by induction. The Theorem is proved.

8 Stopping times and martingales: reminder

Definition 26. *Filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n,\, n = 0, 1, \ldots)$ is a familty of increasing sigma-fields on a probablity space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ completed with respect to the measure P (that is, each $\mathcal{F}_n$ contains each subset of all P-zero sets from $\mathcal{F}$). The process (M_n) is called a martingale with respect to a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ iff $\mathbb{E}M_n < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}(M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n) = M_n$ (a.s.).*

Definition 27. *A random variable $\tau < \infty$ a.s. with values in $\mathbb{Z}_+$ is called a stopping time with respect to a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)$ iff for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ the event $(\tau > n)$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_n$.*

It is recommended to read about simple propertis of martingales and stopping times in one of the textbooks on stochastic processes, e.g., [25]. We will only need the following classical result about stopped martingales.

Theorem 28 (Doob)**.** *Let (M_n) be a martingale and let τ be a stopping time with respect to a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)$. Then $(\tilde{M}_n := M_{n\wedge\tau})$ is also a martingale.*

In terms of martingales, the first Dynkin's formula may be re-phrased as follows.

Theorem 29 (Dynkin's formula 2)**.** *On the finite state space $\mathcal{S}$, for any function h and any $n = 1, 2, \ldots$, the process*

$$M_n := h(X_n) - h(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Lh(X_k), \quad n \geq 0, \tag{30}$$

is a martingales with respect to the natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_n^X$ "generated" by the process X. Vice versa, if the process M_n from (30) is a martingale then (29) holds true.

Proof. The inverse statement is trivial. The main part follows easily from a little calculus, due to Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(M_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}) &= \mathbb{E}(h(X_n)|X_{n-1}) - h(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Lh(X_k) \\
&= \mathcal{P}h(X_{n-1}) - Lh(X_{n-1}) - h(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} Lh(X_k) \\
&= h(X_{n-1}) - h(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} Lh(X_k) = M_{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Theorem is proved.

9 Poisson equation without a potential

9.1 Introduction

Here we consider the following discrete Poisson equation *without a potential,*

$$Lu(x) \equiv \mathcal{P}u(x) - u(x) = -f(x). \tag{31}$$

In the next section a similar discrete equation *with a potential* $c = c(x)$, $x \in \mathcal{S}$, will be studied,

$$L^c u(x) := \exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P}u(x) - u(x) = -f(x), \tag{32}$$

firstly because it is natural for PDEs – and here we present an easier but similar discrete-time theory – and secondly with a hope that it may be also useful for some further extensions, as it already happened with equations without a potential. Let μ be, as usual, the (unique) invariant probability measure of X.

Lemma 30 (Dynkin's formula 3)**.** *Let τ be a stopping time with*

$$\mathbb{E}_x \tau < \infty, \quad \forall\, x \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Then for any function h on $\mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_x h(X_\tau) = h(x) + \mathbb{E}_x \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} Lh(X_k).$$

Proof. Follows straightforward from the Theorem 29.

9.2 Poisson equation (31) with a boundary

Firstly, we consider Poisson equation with a non-empty boundary,

$$Lu(x) = -f(x), \;\; x \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \Gamma, \quad u(x) = g(x), \; x \in \Gamma, \tag{33}$$

where $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{S}$, $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$. If the right hand side equals zero, this equation is called the Laplace equation with Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$Lu(x) = 0, \;\; x \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \Gamma, \quad u(x) = g(x), \; x \in \Gamma. \tag{34}$$

Let

$$\tau := \inf(n \geq 0 : \; X_n \in \Gamma),$$

and denote

$$v(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} f(X_k) + g(X_\tau) \right). \tag{35}$$

Recall that under our assumptions on the process, necessarily $\mathbb{E}_x \tau < \infty$.

For the uniqueness, we would need a **maximum principle**, which holds true for the Laplace equation (recall that we always assume $\inf p_{ij} > 0$):

Lemma 31 (Max principle)**.** *If the function u satisfies the equation (34), then the maximal value (as well as minimal) of this function is necessarily attained at the boundary Γ.*

Proof. Since $Lu(x) = 0$ for any $x \notin \Gamma$, we have

$$u(x) = \mathcal{P}u(x), \tag{36}$$

for such x. In other words, the value $u(x)$ is equal to the average of the values $u(y)$ at **all** other $y \in \mathcal{S}$ with some positive weights, due to the assumption $\min_{ij} p_{ij} > 0$. However, if a maximal value, say, M, is attained by the function u *not* at the boundary, say, $u(x_0) = M$, and if at least one value on Γ (or, actually, anywhere else), is strictly less than M, we immediately get a contradiction, as the equality $\sum_{y\in\mathcal{S}} p_{xy}v(y) = M$ with all $v(y) \le M$ and some – at least, one – $v(y) < M$ is impossible. Similar arguments also apply to the minimal vale of u. This proves the Lemma.

Theorem 32. *The function $v(x)$ given by the formula (35) is a unique solution of the Poisson equation (33).*

Proof. **1.** The boundary condition $v(x) = g(x)$ on $x \in \Gamma$ is trivial, as $\tau = 0$ for such initial value x of the process.

2. Let $x \notin \Gamma$. Then $\tau \ge 1$. We have, due to the Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= f(x) + \sum_y \mathbb{E}_x 1(X_1 = y)\mathbb{E}_y \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} f(X_k) + g(X_\tau) \right) \\ &= f(x) + \sum_y p_{xy} v(y) = f(x) + \mathbb{E}_x v(X_1). \end{aligned}$$

From this, it follows clearly the statement about solving the equation,

$$Lv(x) = \mathbb{E}_x v(X_1) - v(x) = -f(x).$$

3. Uniqueness follows from the maximal principle. Indeed, let v^1 and v^2 be two solutions. Then

$$u(x) := v^1(x) - v^2(x) = 0, \quad \forall\ x \in \Gamma.$$

Also, at any $x \notin \Gamma$,

$$Lu(x) = Lv^1(x) - Lv^2(x) = 0.$$

Hence, by virtue of the Lemma 31, both maximal and miniml values of the function u are attained at the boundary Γ. However, at the boundary both these values are equal to zero. Therefore,

$$u(x) = 0, \quad \forall\, x \in \mathcal{S},$$

that is, $v^1 - v^2 \equiv 0$, as required. This completes the proof of the Theorem.

9.3 Poisson equation (31) without a boundary

Consider the equation on the whole $\mathcal{S}$,

$$Lu(x) = -f(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{S}. \tag{37}$$

We will need an addditional assumption on the right hand side f of this equation, called "centering". This condition is a close analogue of the subtraction hint in the standardization for the CLT.

Assumption 33 (Centering)**.** *It is assumed that the function f satisfies the condition,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_0) \equiv \sum_x f(x)\mu(x) = 0, \tag{38}$$

where μ is the (unique) invariant measure of the process X.

Theorem 34. *Under the assumption (38), the equation (37) has a solution u, which is unique up to an additive constant. This solution is given by the formula*

$$u(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_x f(X_k). \tag{39}$$

The solution u from (39) itself satisfies the centering condition,

$$\sum u(x)\mu(x) = 0. \tag{40}$$

Note that the "educated guess" about a solution represented by the formula (39) may be deduced from the comparison with (35) where, so to say, we want to drop the terminal summand g as there is no boundary and to replace τ by infinity by the same intuitive reason; naturally, $\mathbb{E}$ and the summation should be interchanged. Also note that in the present setting the idea based on considering the series for $(I - \mathcal{P})^{-1}$ on centered functions may be applied. Yet, we would like to avoid this way because in a more general "non-compact" situation a *polynomial* convergence of the series in (39) would also suffice, and, hence, this approach looks more general.

Proof of Theorem 34. **1. Convergence.** Follows straightforward from the Corollary 9.

2. Satisfying the equation. From the Markov property,

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &= f(x) + \sum_y \mathbb{E}_x 1(X_1 = y)\mathbb{E}_y \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(X_k) \\ &= f(x) + \sum_y p_{xy} v(y) = f(x) + \mathbb{E}_x u(X_1). \end{aligned}$$

From this, it follows clearly the statement,

$$Lu(x) = \mathbb{E}_x u(X_1) - u(x) = -f(x).$$

3. Uniqueness. Let u^1 and u^2 be two solutions both satisfying the moderate growth and centaring. Denote $v = u^1 - u^2$. Then

$$Lv = 0.$$

By virtue of Dynkin's formula,

$$\mathbb{E}v(X_n) - v(x) = 0.$$

However, due to the same Corollary 9,

$$\mathbb{E}_x v(X_n) \to \mathbb{E}_{inv} v(X_0) = 0.$$

Hence,

$$v^1(x) \equiv 0,$$

as required.

4. Centering. we have,

$$\sum u(x)\mu(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_x f(X_k).$$

The Theorem is proved.

10 Poisson equation with a potential

10.1 Equation (32)

Recall the equation (32),

$$\exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P}u(x) - u(x) = -f(x).$$

A natural candidate for the solution is the function

$$u(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_x \exp\left(-\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c(X_k)\right) f(X_k), \tag{41}$$

provided that this expression is well-defined. Assume both f and c bounded. Denote

$$\gamma_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n} c(X_k),$$

and

$$L^c := \exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P} - I,$$

that is,

$$L^c u(x) := \exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P}u(x) - u(x).$$

We can tackle several cases, and the most interesting one is where $c(x) = \varepsilon c_1(x)$, $\varepsilon > 0$ *small* and $\int c_1 d\mu > 0$. Denote

$$\bar{c} = \sum_x c(x)\mu(x), \quad \bar{c}_1 = \sum_x c_1(x)\mu(x).$$

10.2 Further Dynkin's formulae

Recall that $\mathcal{S}$ is finite.

Lemma 35 (Dynkin's formula 4)**.**

$$\mathbb{E}_x \exp(-\gamma_{n-1})\, h(X_n) = h(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_x L^c h(X_k). \tag{42}$$

In other words, the process

$$M_n := \exp(-\gamma_{n-1})\, h(X_n) - h(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^c h(X_k), \quad n \geq 0, \tag{43}$$

is a martingale.

Proof. Let us check the base, $n = 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}_x \exp(0)\, h(X_0) = h(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{-1} \mathbb{E}_x L^c h(X_k).$$

Here both sides equal the same value $h(x)$, under the standard convention that $\sum_{k=0}^{-1} \cdots = 0$.

Let us check the first step, $n = 1$:

$$\mathbb{E}_x \exp(-c(x))\, h(X_1) = h(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{0} \mathbb{E}_x L^c h(X_k) \equiv h(x) + \exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P}h(x) - h(x),$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}_x \exp(-c(x))\, h(X_1) = \exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P}h(x),$$

where the r.h.s. is the definition of expectation in the l.h.s.

The induction step with a general $n \geq 1$ follows similarly, using the Markov property. The Lemma is proved.

Lemma 36 (Dynkin's formula 5)**.** *Let τ be a stopping time with*

$$E_x e^{\alpha\tau} < \infty, \quad \forall\, x \in \mathcal{S},$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. Then for any function h on $\mathcal{S}$ and if $c = \epsilon c_1$ and ϵ is small enough,

$$\mathbb{E}_x e^{-\gamma_{\tau-1}} h(X_\tau) = h(x) + \mathbb{E}_x \sum_{k=0}^{\tau-1} e^{-\gamma_{k-1}} L^c h(X_k).$$

Proof. This is a version of a theorem about stopped martingales and the proof is left to the reader as an *exercise*.

To complete?!

10.3 Poisson equation with a potential with a boundary

Recall the equation *with the boundary*:

$$\exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P}u(x) - u(x) = -f(x),\ x \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \Gamma, \quad u(x) = g(x),\ x \in \Gamma, \tag{44}$$

with $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$. The natural candidate for the solution is the function

$$u(x) := \mathbb{E}_x \sum_{n=0}^{\tau-1} \exp\left(-\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c(X_k)\right) f(X_k), \quad \tau = \inf(n \geq 0 :\ X_n \in \Gamma). \tag{45}$$

Theorem 37. *If the expectation in (45) is finite then the function $u(x)$ is a unique solution of the equation (44).*

The proof may be established similarly to the proof of the Theorem 32 and it is left to the reader.

We have, ...

To complete!

10.4 Poisson equation with a potential without a boundary

Recall the equation (32):

$$\exp(-c(x))\mathcal{P}u(x) - u(x) = -f(x),$$

and the natural candidate for the solution is the function

$$u(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} E_x \exp\left(-\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c(X_k)\right) f(X_k), \tag{46}$$

The main question here is the question of convergence. As was mentioned earlier, we are interested in the following case: $c(x) = \epsilon c_1(x)$, $\epsilon > 0$ small, and $\sum c_1(x)\mu(x) > 0$, where μ is the unique invariant measure of the Markov chain.

10.5 Convergence

The first goal is to justify that u is well-defined. Recall that we want to show convergence of the series,

$$u(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_x \exp\left(-\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c(X_k)\right) f(X_n),$$

with $c(x) = \epsilon c_1(x)$, $\bar{c}_1 = \sum c_1(x)\mu(x) > 0$, with $\epsilon > 0$ small. Denote

$$H_n(\beta) := n^{-1} \ln \mathbb{E}_x \exp\left(\beta \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_1(X_k)\right),$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mathbb{E}_x \exp\left(\beta \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_1(X_k)\right) = \mathbb{E}_x \exp(n\, H_n(\beta)).$$

(Note that this notation differs from how the function H was defined in the section 6: now it is constructed via the "additive functional" related to another function c_1.) Let

$$H(\beta) := \lim_{T\to\infty} H_T(\beta), \qquad \beta \in R^d.$$

As we have seen in the section 6, this limit does exist **for all values of** β. (In the section 6 this was shown for another function and under the centering condition for that function. Yet, this is of no importance because the average may be always subtracted.)

Also, it may be proved – *left as an exercise to the reader (here some Lemma from [23] about estimating the spectral radius may be useful)* – that the limit is locally uniform, i.e., if $\delta > 0$ then tere exists $n(\delta)$ such that

$$\sup_{|\beta|\le B} |H(\beta) - H_n(\beta, x)| \le \delta, \quad n \ge n(\delta).$$

Unlike in the section 6 where it was assumed that $\bar{f} = 0$, here we compute,

$$H_n'(0) = n^{-1}\mathbb{E}_x \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_1(X_k),$$

and due to the Corollary 9 it follows easily,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1}\mathbb{E}_x \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_1(X_k) = \bar{c}_1 = \langle \bar{c}_1, \mu\rangle > 0.$$

This means that in our case (and unlike in the section 6 where he centered situation was considered)

$$H'(0) = \bar{c}_1 > 0$$

and that, at least, in some neighbourhood of zero,

$$H(\beta) > 0, \quad \beta > 0, \qquad \& \qquad H(\beta) < 0, \quad \beta < 0. \tag{47}$$

Now, convergence of the sum defining u for each x for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough (but not depending on x) follows from (47). Indeed, choose $\epsilon > 0$ so that $H(-\epsilon) < 0$ and for a fixed $\delta = -H(-\epsilon)/2$ also choose n_0 such that $|H_n(-\epsilon, x) - H(-\epsilon)| < \delta$, for all $n \ge n_0$. We estimate, for ϵ small and any x (and with ϵ independent of x),

$$|u(x)| \le \|f\|_B \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_x \exp\left(-\varepsilon \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_1(X_k)\right) = \|f\|_B \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp(nH_n(-\epsilon, x))$$

$$\le \|f\|_B \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp(n(H(-\epsilon) + \delta)) \le \|f\|_B \exp(\delta) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp(nH(-\epsilon)) < \infty.$$

10.6 u solves the equation

Let us argue why the function u solves the Poisson equation (32). By the Markov property,

$$u(x) = f(x) + \exp(-c(x)) \sum_y \mathbb{E}_x 1(X_1 = y) \mathbb{E}_y \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \exp(-\gamma_{k-1}) f(X_k)$$

$$= f(x) + \exp(-c(x)) \sum_y p_{xy} v(y) = f(x) + \exp(-c(x)) \mathbb{E}_x u(X_1).$$

From this, it follows clearly that

$$L^c u(x) = \exp(-c(x)) \mathbb{E}_x u(X_1) - u(x) = -f(x),$$

as required.

10.7 Uniqueness of solution

Uniqueness may be shown in a standard manner. For the difference of two solutions $v = u^1 - u^2$ we have $Lv - cv = 0$. So, by applying once the equation for the difference, $L^c u(x) = 0$, we get,

$$u(x) = \exp(-c(x) \mathbb{E}_x u(X_1).$$

After iterating this formula by induction n times, we obtain,

$$v(x) = \mathbb{E}_x \exp(-\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c(X_k)) v(X_n).$$

Recall that the function v is necessarily bounded. Hence, it follows that $v(x) \equiv 0$. Indeed, we estimate,

$$|v(x)| = |\mathbb{E}_x \exp(-\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c(X_k)) v(X_n)| \leq C \mathbb{E}_x \exp(-\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c(X_k)).$$

Hence, we get, for *any* $n \geq 0$,

$$|v(x)| \leq C \mathbb{E}_x \exp(-\epsilon \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_1(X_k)) = C \exp(n H_n(-\epsilon)). \tag{48}$$

Recall that $H_n(\beta, x) \to H(\beta)$, $n \to \infty$, and that $H(-\epsilon) < 0$ for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. Hence, the right hand side in (48) converges to zero exponentially fast with $n \to \infty$. On the other hand, the left hand side does not depend on n. Therefore, $|v(x)| = 0$, i.e., $u^1 \equiv u^2$, as required.

11 Ergodic Theorem, general case

Now let us consider a more general construction on a **more general state space**. We will be returning to the finite state case in the sequel frequantly, so as to simplify the outlook and to clarify the ideas. Let $x, x' \in S$, $n \geq 1$, and $P_{x'}(n, dy) = P^a_{x'}(n, dy) + P^s_{x'}(n, dy)$ be the Lebesgue decomposition of the measure $P_{x'}(n, dy)$ with absolute continuous and singular components with respect to $P_x(n, dy)$. We assume that

$$\kappa := \inf_{x,x'} \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(1, dy)}{P_x(1, dy)} \wedge 1 \right) P_x(1, dy) > 0. \tag{49}$$

Note that $\frac{P_{x'}(1,dy)}{P_x(1,dy)}$ is understood in the sense of the density of the absolute continuous components. For brevity we will be using a simplified notation $P_x(dz)$ for $P_x(1, dz)$.

Let $x, x' \in \mathcal{S}$ and let Λ be a measure with respect to which both $P_x(dz)$ and $P_{x'}(dz)$ are absolutely continuous. We have another representation of the constant κ from (49).

Lemma 38. *We have,*

$$\kappa = \inf_{x,x'} \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \right) \Lambda(dy). \tag{50}$$

Proof. Firtstly, note that clearly the right hand side in (38) does not depend on any particular measure Λ, i.e., for any other measure with respect to which both $P_{x'}(dy)$ and $P_x(dy)$ are absolutely continuous. Indeed, it follows straightforward from the fact that if, say, $d\Lambda << d\tilde{\Lambda}$ and $d\Lambda = f d\tilde{\Lambda}$, then we get,

$$\int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \right) \Lambda(dy) = \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{f\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{f\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \right) f(y) 1(f(y) > 0) \tilde{\Lambda}(dy)$$

$$= \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \right) 1(f(y) > 0) \tilde{\Lambda}(dy).$$

However, $P_{x'}(dy) << \Lambda(dy) = f(y)\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)$, so for any measurable A we have $\int_A P_{x'}(dy) 1(f(y) = 0) = 0$ and the same for P_x, which means that, actually,

$$\int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \right) 1(f(y) > 0) \tilde{\Lambda}(dy) = \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{\tilde{\Lambda}(dy)} \right) \tilde{\Lambda}(dy).$$

Respectively, if there are two reference measure Λ and, say, Λ', then we may take $\tilde{\Lambda} = \Lambda + \Lambda'$, and the coefficients computed by using each of the two – Λ and Λ' – will be represented via $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in the same way.

Secondly, for κ from (49), let Λ be any reference measure for both P_x and $P_{x'}$, and let $f = dP_x/d\Lambda$. Then,

$$\kappa = \inf_{x,x'} \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{P_x(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{P_x(dy)} \right) P_x(dy)$$

$$= \inf_{x,x'} \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{f(y)\Lambda(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{f(y)\Lambda(dy)} \right) f(y)\Lambda(dy) = \inf_{x,x'} \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \right) \Lambda(dy),$$

as required. The Lemma 38 is proved.

Let $x, x' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $P^a_{x'}(dy)$ be the absolutely continuous component of the measure $P_{x'}(\cdot)$ with respect to $P_x(\cdot)$. Denote

$$\Gamma(x, x') := \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{P_x(dy)} \wedge 1 \right) P_x(dy).$$

Clearly, for any $x, x' \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\Gamma(x, x') \geq \kappa. \tag{51}$$

Lemma 39. *For any $x, x' \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$\Gamma(x, x') = \Gamma(x', x).$$

Proof. We have, with any reference measure Λ for P_x and $P_{x'}$,

$$\Gamma(x', x) = \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{P_x(dy)} \wedge 1 \right) P_x(dy) = \int \left(\frac{P_{x'}(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dy)}{\Lambda(dy)} \right) \Lambda(dy),$$

which expression is, apparently, symmetric with respect to x and x', as required. The Lemma 39 is proved.

Definition 40. *If an MC (X_n) satisfies the condition (49), or, equivalently, (50), – we call it* **MD-condition** *in the sequel – then we call this process* Markov–Dobrushin's or MD-process.

This condition in an easier situation of finite chains was introduced by Markov himself [28]; later on, for non-homogeneous Markov processes its analogue was suggested and used by Dobrushin. So, we call it Markov–Dobrushin's condition, as suggested by Seneta. Note that, clearly, in all cases $\kappa \leq 1$, and that the case $\kappa = 1$ corresponds to the i.i.d. sequence (X_n), which is, of course, a trivial case of a homogeneous Markov chain (MC) with independent random variables $X_0, X_1, \ldots$ and identical distributions of each X_n. In the opposite extreme situation where the transition kernels are singular for different x and x', we have $\kappa = 0$.

The MD-condition (49) is most useful because it provides an **effective** quantitative upper bound for convergence rate of a Markov chain towards its (unique) invariant measure in total variation.

Theorem 41. *Let the assumption (49) (or, equivalently, (50)) hold true. Then the process (X_n) is ergodic, i.e., there exists a limiting probability measure μ, which is stationary and such that (1) holds true. Moreover, the uniform bound is satisfied for every n,*

$$\sup_x \sup_{A \in \mathcal{S}} |P_x(n, A) - \mu(A)| \leq (1 - \kappa)^n. \tag{52}$$

Recall that the **total variation distance** or metric between two probability measures may be defined as

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} := 2 \sup_A (\mu(A) - \nu(A)).$$

Hence, the inequality (53) may be rewritten as

$$\sup_x \|P_x(n, \cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq 2(1 - \kappa)^n, \tag{53}$$

Proof. **1.** Denote for any measurable $A \subset \mathcal{S}$,

$$M^{(n)}(A) := \sup_x \mathbb{P}_x(n, A), \quad m^{(n)}(A) := \inf_x \mathbb{P}_x(n, A).$$

Due to the Chapman–Kolmogorov equation we have,

$$m^{(n)}(A) = \inf_x \mathbb{P}_x(n+1, A) = \inf_x \int P_x(dz) P_z(n, A)$$

$$\geq \inf_x \int P_x(dz) m^{(n)}(A) = m^{(n)}(A).$$

So, the sequence $(m^{(n)}(A))$ does not increase. Similarly, $(M^{(n)}(A))$ does not decrease. We are going to show the estimate

$$M^{(n)}(A) - m^{(n)}(A) \leq (1-\kappa)^n. \tag{54}$$

2. Let $x, x' \in \mathcal{S}$, and let Λ be some reference measure for both $P_x(dz)$ and $P_{x'}(dz)$. As earlier, denote by $P_x^a(dz)$ and $P_{x'}^a(dz)$ the absolutely continuous components of both measures with respect to each other, and P_x^s and respectively $P_{x'}^s$ – their singular component with respect to each other. Again by virtue of Chapman–Kolmogorov's equation we have for any $n > 1$,

$$P_x(n, A) - P_{x'}(n, A) = \int [P_x(dz) - P_{x'}(dz)] P_z(n-1, A)$$

$$= \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right) \Lambda(dz)\, P_z(n-1, A)$$

$$= \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_+ \Lambda(dz)\, P_z(n-1, A) + \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_- \Lambda(dz)\, P_z(n-1, A).$$

Recall that we accept the notations, $a_+ = a \vee 0$, and $a_- = a \wedge 0$. Further, we have,

$$\int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_+ \Lambda(dz)\, P_z(n-1, A) \leq \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_+ \Lambda(dz)\, M^{(n-1)}(A),$$

and similarly,

$$\int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_- \Lambda(dz)\, P_z(n-1, A) \leq \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_- \Lambda(dz)\, m^{(n-1)}(A),$$

On the other hand,

$$\int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_+ \Lambda(dz) + \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_- \Lambda(dz)$$

$$= \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right) \Lambda(dz) = 1 - 1 = 0.$$

Thus, we get,

$$M^{(n)}(A) - m^{(n)}(A) = \sup_x P_x(n, A) - \inf_{x'} P_{x'}(n, A)$$

$$\leq \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_+ \Lambda(dz) \, (M^{(n-1)}(A) - m^{(n)}(A)).$$

It remains to notice that

$$\int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right)_+ \Lambda(dz)$$

$$= \int \left(\frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} - \frac{P_{x'}(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \wedge \frac{P_x(dz)}{\Lambda(dz)} \right) \Lambda(dz) = 1 - \Gamma(x, x') \leq 1 - \kappa.$$

Now the bound (54) follows by induction.

3. Let us establish the existence of at least one stationary distribution. For any $x \in \mathcal{S}$ and any measurable A,

$$m^{(n)}(A) \leq P_x(n, A) \leq M^{(n)}(A), \tag{55}$$

so that the sequence $(P_x(n, A))$ is a Cauchy sequence, which convergences uniformly with respect to A. So, both these sequences have limits, which limits coincide and are uniform in A. Indeed,

$$|P_x(n+1, A) - P_x(n, A)| = |P_{\mu_1}(n, A) - P_x(n, A)| \leq (1 - \kappa)^n, \tag{56}$$

where μ_1 stands for the distribution of the process X_1 with the initial state x. The last inequality here in (56) follows straightforward from (54). Denote

$$q(A) := \lim_{n \to \infty} P_x(n, A), \tag{57}$$

for any fixed chosen x. Clearly, due to this uniform convergence, the function $q(\cdot) \geq 0$, $q(\mathcal{S}) = 1$, and this function is additive in A. More than that, by virtue of the same uniform convergence in A in (57), the function $q(\cdot)$ is also "continuous at zero", i.e. it is, actually, a (sigma-additive) measure. More than that, the uniform convergence means, actually,

$$\|q_x^{(n)}(\cdot) - q(\cdot)\|_{TV} \to 0, \quad n \to \infty. \tag{58}$$

4. Now, let us show stationarity. We have,

$$q(A) = \lim_{n \to \infty} P_{x_0}(n, A) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \int P_{x_0}(n-1, dz) P_z(A)$$

$$= \int q(dz) P_z(A) + \lim_{n \to \infty} \int (P_{x_0}(n-1, dz) - q(dz)) P_z(A).$$

Here, in fact, the second term equals zero. Indeed,

$$|\int (P_{x_0}(n-1,dz)-q(dz))P_z(A)| \le \int |P_{x_0}(n-1,dz)-q(dz)|P_z(A)$$

$$\le \||P_{x_0}(n-1,\cdot)-q(\cdot)\|_{TV} \to 0, \quad n\to\infty.$$

Thus, we find that

$$q(A)=\int q(dz)P_z(A),$$

which is the definition of stationarity. The Theorem 52 is proved.

Corollary 42. *For any bounded Borel function f,*

$$\sup_x |\mathbb{E}_x f(X_t)|X_s) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_t)| \equiv \sup_x |\mathbb{E}_x (f(X_t) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_t)|X_s)| \le C_f (1-\kappa)^{t-s},$$

or, equivalently,

$$\sup_x |\mathbb{E}_x f(X_t)|\mathcal{F}_s^X) - \mathbb{E}_{inv} f(X_t)| \le C_f (1-\kappa)^{t-s},$$

12 Coupling method: general version

This more general version requires a change of probability space so as to construct coupling. Results themselves in no way pretend to be new: we just suggest a presentation convenient for the author. In particular, all newly arising probability spaces on each step (i.e., at each time n) are explicitly shown. By "general" we do not mean that it is the most general possible: this issue is not adressed here. Just it is more general that in the section 5, and it is more involved because of the more complicated probabiity space, and it provides a better constant in the convergence bound. It turns out that the general version requires a bit of preparation; hence, we start with the section devoted to a couple of random variables, while the case of Markov chains will be considered separately in the next section.

The following folklore yet important lemma answers the following question: suppose we have two distributions, which are not singular, and the "common area" equals some positive constant κ. Is it possible to realise these two distributions on the same probability space so that the two corresponding random variables *coincide* exactly with probability κ? We call one version of this result "the lemma about three random variables", and another one "the lemma about two random variables".

Lemma 43 ("Of three random variables")**.** *Let ξ^1 and ξ^2 be two random variales on their (wlog different, which will be made independent after we take their product!) probability spaces $(\Omega^1,\mathcal{F}^1,\mathbb{P}^1)$ and $(\Omega^2,\mathcal{F}^2,\mathbb{P}^2)$ and with densities p^1 and p^2 with respect to some reference measure Λ, correspondingly. Then, if Markov – Dobrushin's condition holds true,*

$$\kappa := \int \left(p^1(x)\wedge p^2(x)\right)\Lambda(dx) > 0, \tag{59}$$

then there exists one more probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ *and a random variable on it* ξ^3 *(and* ξ^2 *also lives on* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$*, clearly, with the same distribution) such that*

$$\mathcal{L}(\xi^3) = \mathcal{L}(\xi^1), \quad \& \quad P(\xi^3 = \xi^2) = \kappa. \tag{60}$$

Note that in the case $\kappa = 1$ we have $p^1 = p^2$, so we can just assign $\xi^3 := \xi^2$, and then immediately both assertions of (60) hold. In the opposite extreme situation of $\kappa = 0$ the two distributions are singular, we can pose $\xi^3 := \xi^1$, and again both claims in (60) are satisfied trivially. Hence, in the proof below it suffices to assume

$$0 < \kappa < 1.$$

Proof of Lemma 43.
1: Construction. We will need two new independent random variables, $\zeta \sim U[0,1]$ and η with the density

$$p^\eta(x) := \frac{p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2}{\int (p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2)}(x) \equiv \frac{p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2}{\int_{A_1} (p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2)}(x).$$

Now let (on the product of all our probability spaces)

$$\xi^3 := \xi^2 1(\frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2) \geq \zeta) + \eta 1(\frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2) < \zeta).$$

We shall see that ξ^3 admits all the desired properties. Denote

$$C := \{\omega : \ \frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2) \geq \zeta\}.$$

Then ξ^3 may be rewritten as

$$\xi^3 = \xi^2 1(C) + \eta 1(\bar{C}). \tag{61}$$

2: Verification. Let

$$A_1 := \{x : \ p^1(x) \geq p^2(x)\}, \quad A_2 := \{x : \ p^1(x) < p^2(x)\},$$

and

$$c := \int_{A_1} (p^1(x) - p^2(x))\Lambda(dx).$$

Note that also

$$c = \int_{A_2} (p^2(x) - p^1(x))\Lambda(dx),$$

and that actually due to our assumptions,

$$c + \kappa = \int_{A_1} (p^1(x) - p^2(x))\Lambda(dx) + \int \left(p^1(x) \wedge p^2(x)\right) \Lambda(dx)$$

$$= \int_{A_1} (p^1(x) - p^2(x))\Lambda(dx) + \int_{A_1} \left(p^1(x) \wedge p^2(x)\right) \Lambda(dx) + \int_{A_2} \left(p^1(x) \wedge p^2(x)\right) \Lambda(dx)$$

$$= \int_{A_1} p^1(x)\Lambda(dx) + \int_{A_2} p^1(x)\Lambda(dx) = \int_{A_1 \cup A_2} p^1(x)\Lambda(dx) = 1.$$

So,

$$c = 1 - \kappa \in (0, 1).$$

Also,

$$p^\eta(x) = \frac{p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2}{c}(x).$$

Also notice that

$$\mathbb{P}(C|\xi^2) = \frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2),$$

and recall that on C, $\xi^3 = \xi^2$, while on its complement $\bar{C}$, $\xi^3 = \eta$. Now, for any bounded Borel measurable function g we have,

$$\mathbb{E}g(\xi^3) = \mathbb{E}g(\xi^3)1(C) + \mathbb{E}g(\xi^3)1(\bar{C}) = \mathbb{E}g(\xi^2)1(C) + \mathbb{E}g(\eta)1(\bar{C})$$

$$= \mathbb{E}g(\xi^2)\frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2) + \mathbb{E}g(\eta)(1 - \frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2))$$

$$= \mathbb{E}g(\xi^2)\frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2) + \mathbb{E}g(\eta)\mathbb{E}(1 - \frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(\xi^2))$$

$$= \int_{A_1 \cup A_2} g(x)\frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(x)p^2(x)\Lambda(dx) + \int_{(A_1)} g(x)p^\eta(x)\Lambda(dx) \times \int_{(A_2)} (1 - \frac{p^1}{p^1 \vee p^2}(y))p^2(y)\Lambda(dy)$$

$$= \int_{A_1} g(x)p^2(x)\Lambda(dx) + \int_{A_2} g(x)p^1(x)\Lambda(dx)$$

$$+ \int_{A_1} g(x)\frac{p^1 - p^2}{c}(x)\Lambda(dx) \times \int_{A_2} (p^2 - p^1)(y)\Lambda(dy)$$

$$= \int_{A_1 \cup A_2} g(x)p^1(x)\Lambda(dx) = \mathbb{E}g(\xi^1).$$

Here (A_1) in $\int_{(A_1)} g(x)p^\eta(x)\Lambda(dx)$ is used with the followng meaning: the integral is originally taken over the whole domain, but integration outside the set A_1 gives zero; hence, only the integral over this domain remains. The established equality $\mathbb{E}g(\xi^3) = \mathbb{E}g(\xi^1)$ means that $\mathcal{L}(\xi^3) = \mathcal{L}(\xi^1)$, as required.

Finally, from the definition of ξ^3 it is straightforward that

$$P(\xi^3 = \xi^2) \geq P(C).$$

So,

$$P(\xi^3=\xi^2)\geq P(C)=\mathbb{E}\frac{p^1}{p^1\vee p^2}(\xi^2)=\int\frac{p^1}{p^1\vee p^2}(x)p^2(x)\Lambda(dx)$$

$$=\int_{A_1}\frac{p^1}{p^1\vee p^2}(x)p^2(x)\Lambda(dx)+\int_{A_2}\frac{p^1}{p^1\vee p^2}(x)p^2(x)\Lambda(dx)$$

$$=\int_{A_1}p^2(x)\Lambda(dx)+\int_{A_2}\frac{p^1}{p^1\vee p^2}(x)p^1(x)\Lambda(dx)=\int(p^1\wedge p^2)\Lambda(dx)=\kappa.$$

Let us argue why, actually,

$$P(\xi^3=\xi^2)=P(C)\equiv\kappa,$$

i.e., why the inequality $P(\xi^3=\xi^2)\geq P(C)$ may not be strict. Indeed, $P(\xi^3=\xi^2)>P(C)$ may only occur if $P(\eta 1(\bar{C})=\xi^2)>0$ (cf. with (61)), or, equivalently, if $P\left(\eta 1(\frac{p^1}{p^1\vee p^2}(\xi^2)<\zeta)=\xi^2\right)>0$. However,

$$\omega\in\bar{C}=\{\omega:\ \frac{p^1}{p^1\vee p^2}(\xi^2)<\zeta\}.$$

implies $p^1(\xi_2)<p^2(\xi_2)$, that is, $\xi_2\in A_2$; but on this set the density of η equals zero. Hence, $P(\xi^3=\xi^2)>P(C)$ is not possible, which means that, in fact, we have proved that $P(\xi^3=\xi^2)=P(C)\equiv\kappa$, as required. The Lemma 43 is proved.

A bit more convenient in applications – and also, actually, easier to prove – is another, "symmetric" version of the latter lemma.

Lemma 44 ("Of two random variables"). *Let ξ^1 and ξ^2 be two random variales on their (wlog different, which will be made independent after we take their product!) probability spaces $(\Omega^1,\mathcal{F}^1,\mathbb{P}^1)$ and $(\Omega^2,\mathcal{F}^2,\mathbb{P}^2)$ and with densities p^1 and p^2 with respect to some reference measure Λ, correspondingly. Then, if*

$$\kappa:=\int\left(p^1(x)\wedge p^2(x)\right)\Lambda(dx)>0, \tag{62}$$

then there exists one more probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P})$ and two random variables on it η^1,η^2 such that

$$\mathcal{L}(\eta^j)=\mathcal{L}(\xi^j),\ j=1,2,\quad\&\quad P(\eta^1=\eta^2)=\kappa. \tag{63}$$

Proof of Lemma 44.
1: Construction. We will need now *four* new independent random variables, Bernoulli r.v. γ with $P(\gamma=0)=\kappa$ and $\zeta^{0,1,2}$ with the densities

$$p^{\zeta^1}(x):=\frac{p^1-p^1\wedge p^2}{\int(p^1-p^1\wedge p^2)}(x),\quad p^{\zeta^2}(x):=\frac{p^2-p^1\wedge p^2}{\int(p^2-p^1\wedge p^2)}(x),\quad p^{\zeta^0}(x):=\frac{p^1\wedge p^2}{\int p^1\wedge p^2}(x).$$

We may assume that they are all defined on their new probability spaces and eventually we consider the direct product of these probabilityt spaces. As a result, they are all defined on one comon probability space. Now let (on the product of all our prob spaces...)

$$\eta^1 := \zeta^0 1(\gamma = 0) + \zeta^1 1(\gamma \neq 0), \quad \& \quad \eta^2 := \zeta^0 1(\gamma = 0) + \zeta^2 1(\gamma \neq 0). \tag{64}$$

We shall see that $\eta^{1,2}$ admit all the desired properties.

2: Verification. From (64), clearly,

$$P(\eta^1 = \eta^2) \geq P(\gamma = 0) = \kappa.$$

Yet, we already saw earlier (in slightly different terms) that this may be only an equality, that is, $P(\eta^1 = \eta^2) = P(\gamma = 0) = \kappa$.

Next, since γ, ζ^0 and ζ^1 are independent,

$$\mathbb{E}g(\eta^1) = \mathbb{E}g(\eta^1)1(\gamma = 0) + \mathbb{E}g(\eta^1)1(\gamma \neq 0)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}g(\zeta^0)1(\gamma = 0) + \mathbb{E}g(\zeta^1)1(\gamma \neq 0) = \mathbb{E}g(\zeta^0)\mathbb{E}1(\gamma = 0) + \mathbb{E}g(\zeta^1)\mathbb{E}1(\gamma \neq 0)$$

$$= \kappa \int g(y) p^{\zeta^0}(y)\, dy + (1-\kappa) \int g(y) p^{\zeta^1}(y)\, dy$$

$$= \kappa \int \frac{p^1 \wedge p^2}{\int p^1 \wedge p^2}(x)\Lambda(dx) + (1-\kappa) \int g(x) \frac{p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2}{\int (p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2)}(x)\Lambda(dx)$$

$$= \int p^1 \wedge p^2(x)\Lambda(dx) + \int g(x)(p^1 - p^1 \wedge p^2)(x)\Lambda(dx) = \int g(y) p^1(y)\, dy = \mathbb{E}g(\xi^1).$$

For η^2 the arguments are similar, so also $\mathbb{E}g(\eta^2) = \mathbb{E}g(\xi^2)$. The Lemma 44 is proved.

Remark 45. *Note that the extended probability space in the proof of the Lemma 44 has the form,*

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) = (\Omega^1, \mathcal{F}^1, \mathbb{P}^1) \times (\Omega^2, \mathcal{F}^2, \mathbb{P}^2) \times (\Omega^\gamma, \mathcal{F}^\gamma, \mathbb{P}^\gamma) \times \prod_{k=0}^{2} (\Omega^{\zeta_k}, \mathcal{F}^{\zeta_k}, \mathbb{P}^{\zeta_k}).$$

13 General coupling method for Markov chains

In this section it is explained how to apply general coupling method as in the section 12 to Markov chains. Various presentations of this method may be found in [41], [31], [18], [27], [38], et al. This section follows the lines from [6], which, in turn, is based on [41]. Note that in [6] the state space was $\mathbb{R}^1$; however, in $\mathbb{R}^d$ all formulae remain the same. Clearly, this may be further extended to more general state spaces, although, we will not pursue this goal here.

Let us generalize the Lemma 44 to a sequence of random variables and present our coupling construction for Markov chains based on [vaserstein]. Let us define

$$\kappa(u,v) := \int p(u,t) \wedge p(v,t)\, \Lambda(dt), \tag{65}$$

and

$$\kappa_0 := \int p_{X_0^1}(t) \wedge p_{X_0^2}(t)\, \Lambda(dt). \tag{66}$$

It is clear that $0 \le q(u,v) \le 1$ for all u, v.

We assume that X_0^1 and X_0^2 have different distributions, so $\kappa_0 < 1$. Otherwise we obviously have $X_n^1 \stackrel{d}{=} X_n^2$ for all n, and the coupling can be made trivially, for example, by letting $\widetilde{X}_n^1 = \widetilde{X}_n^2 := X_n^1$.

Introduce a **Markov process** $(\eta_n^1, \eta_n^2, \xi_n, \zeta_n)$. If $\kappa_0 = 0$ then we set

$$\eta_0^1 := X_0^1,\ \eta_0^2 := X_0^2,\ \xi_0 := 0,\ \zeta_0 := 1.$$

Otherwise if $0 < \kappa_0 < 1$, then we apply the Lemma 44 to the random variables X_0^1 and X_0^2 to create η_0^1, η_0^2, ξ_0 and ζ_0.

Let us define the transition probability density φ with respect to the measure Λ for this process,

$$\varphi(x,y) := \varphi_1(x,y^1)\varphi_2(x,y^2)\varphi_3(x,y^3)\varphi_4(x,y^4), \tag{67}$$

where $x = (x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4)$, $y = (y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4)$, and if $0 < \kappa(x^1, x^2) < 1$, then

$$\varphi_1(x,u) := \frac{p(x^1,u) - p(x^1,u) \wedge p(x^2,u)}{1 - \kappa(x^1,x^2)},$$

$$\varphi_2(x,u) := \frac{p(x^2,u) - p(x^1,u) \wedge p(x^2,u)}{1 - \kappa(x^1,x^2)},$$

$$\varphi_3(x,u) := 1(x^4 = 1)\frac{p(x^1,u) \wedge p(x^2,u)}{\kappa(x^1,x^2)} + 1(x^4 = 0)p(x^3,u),$$

$$\varphi_4(x,u) := 1(x^4 = 1)\left(\delta_1(u)(1 - \kappa(x^1,x^2)) + \delta_0(u)\kappa(x^1,x^2)\right) + 1(x^4 = 0)\delta_0(u), \tag{68}$$

where $\delta_i(u)$ is the Kronecker symbol, $\delta_i(u) = 1(u = i)$, or, in other words, the delta measure concentrated at state i. The case $x^4 = 0$ signifies coupling already realised at the previous step, and $u = 0$ means successful coupling at the transition. In the degenerate cases, if $\kappa(x^1, x^2) = 0$ (coupling at the transition is impossible), then we may set, e.g.,

$$\varphi_3(x,u) := 1(x^4 = 1)1(0 < u < 1) + 1(x^4 = 0)p(x^3,u),$$

and if $q(x^1, x^2) = 1$, then we may set

$$\varphi_1(x,u) = \varphi_2(x,u) := 1(0 < u < 1).$$

In fact, in both degenerate cases $\kappa(x^1, x^2) = 0$ or $\kappa(x^1, x^2) = 1$, the functions $\varphi_3(x, u)1(x^4 = 1)$ (or, respectively, $\varphi_1(x, u)$ and $\varphi_2(x, u)$) can be defined more or less arbitrarily, only so as to keep the property of conditional indepedence of the four random variables $\left(\eta^1_{n+1}, \eta^2_{n+1}, \xi_{n+1}, \zeta_{n+1}\right)$ given $(\eta^1_n, \eta^2_n, \xi_n, \zeta_n)$.

Lemma 46. *Let the random variables $\widetilde{X}^1_n$ and $\widetilde{X}^2_n$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ be defined by the following formulae:*

$$\widetilde{X}^1_n := \eta^1_n 1(\zeta_n = 1) + \xi_n 1(\zeta_n = 0),$$
$$\widetilde{X}^2_n := \eta^2_n 1(\zeta_n = 1) + \xi_n 1(\zeta_n = 0).$$

Then

$$\widetilde{X}^1_n \stackrel{d}{=} X^1_n, \quad \widetilde{X}^2_n \stackrel{d}{=} X^2_n, \quad \textit{for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Moreover,

$$\widetilde{X}^1_n = \widetilde{X}^2_n, \quad \forall\, n \geq n_0(\omega) := \inf\{k \geq 0 : \zeta_k = 0\},$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{X}^1_n \neq \widetilde{X}^2_n) \leq (1 - \kappa_0)\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}(1 - \kappa(\eta^1_i, \eta^2_i)). \tag{69}$$

Moreover, $\left(\widetilde{X}^1_n\right)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $\left(\widetilde{X}^2_n\right)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ are both homogeneous Markov processes, and

$$\left(\widetilde{X}^1_n\right)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \stackrel{d}{=} \left(X^1_n\right)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}, \quad \& \quad \left(\widetilde{X}^2_n\right)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \stackrel{d}{=} \left(X^2_n\right)_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_+}. \tag{70}$$

Informally, the processes η^1_n and η^2_n represent X^1_n and X^2_n, correspondingly, under condition that the coupling was not successful until time n, while the process ξ_n represents both X^1_n and X^2_n if the coupling does occur no later than at time n. The process ζ_n represents the moment of coupling: the event $\zeta_n = 0$ is equivalent to the event that coupling occurs no later than at time n. As it follows from (68),

$$P(\zeta_{n+1} = 0|\zeta_n = 0) = 1,$$

$$P(\zeta_{n+1} = 0|\zeta_n = 1, \eta^1_n = x^1, \eta^2_n = x^2) = \kappa(x^1, x^2).$$

Hence, if two processes were coupled at time n, then they remain coupled at time $n+1$, and if they were not coupled, then the coupling occurs with the probability $q(\eta^1_n, \eta^2_n)$. At each time the probability of coupling at the next step is as large as possible, given the current states. *For the proof of Lemma 46* see [6].

References

[1] S. Bernstein, Sur les sommes de quantités dépendantes, Izv. AN SSSR, ser. VI, 1926, 20:15-17, 1459-1478.

[2] S.N. Bernstein, Extension of a limit theorem of probability theory to sums of dependent random variables, Russian Math. Surveys, 1944, 10, 65-114 (in Russian).

[3] Z.I. Bezhaeva, V.I. Oseledets, On the variance of sums for functions of a stationary Markov process, Theory of Probability and its Applications, 1997, 41(3), 537-541.

[4] A.A. Borovkov, Ergodicity and stability of stochastic processes, Wiley, Chichester, NY, et al., 1998.

[5] A. A. Borovkov, A. A. Mogul'skii, Large deviation principles for sums of random vectors and the corresponding renewal functions in the inhomogeneous case, Siberian Advances in Mathematics 25(4), 2015, 255–267.

[6] O.A. Butkovsky, A.Yu. Veretennikov, On asymptotics for Vaserstein coupling of Markov chains, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 123(9), 2013, 3518-3541.

[7] A. Dembo, O. Zeitouni, Large Deviations Techniques and Applications (2nd ed.), Springer, 1998.

[8] R.L. Dobrushin, Central limit theorem for non-stationary Markov chains, I and II, Theory Prob. Appl., 1956, 1, 65-80, 329-383 [English translation].

[9] W. Doeblin, Exposé de la théorie des chaines simples constantes de Markov à un nombre fini d'états. Mathématique de l'Union Interbalkanique, 1938, 2, 77-105 & 78-80.

[10] J.L. Doob, Stochastic Processes, Wiley, 1953.

[11] E.B. Dynkin, Markov processees: vol. 1, Springer, 2012 (paperback).

[12] S.N. Ethier, T.G. Kurtz, Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, 2005 (paperback).

[13] J. Feng, T.G. Kurtz, Large Deviations for Stochastic Processes, AMS, 2006.

[14] M.I. Freidlin, A.D. Wentzell, Random Perturbations of Dynamical Systems, Springer, 1984.

[15] B.V. Gnedenko, Theory of probability, 6th ed., Gordon and Breach Sci. Publ., Amsterdam, The Netherlands, et al., 1997.

[16] D.Z. Griffeath, A maximal coupling for Markov chains, Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete, 1975, 31(2), 95-106.

[17] O.V. Gulinsky, A.Yu. Veretennikov, Large deviations for discrete - time processes with averaging. VSP, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 1993.

[18] V.V. Kalashnikov, Coupling Method, its Development and Applications, In the Russian translation of E. Nummelin, General Irreducible Markov Chains and Non-negative Operators. (1984).

[19] S. Karlin A first course in stochastic processes. Academic press, 2014.

[20] T. Kato, Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[21] A.N. Kolmogorov, A local limit theorem for classical Markov chains. (Russian) Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat. 13, (1949). 281-300.

[22] I. Kontoyiannis, S.P. Meyn, Spectral theory and limit theorems for geometrically ergodic Markov processes. Ann. Appl. Probab. 2003, 13(1), 304–362.

[23] M.A. Krasnosel'skii, E.A. Lifshits, A.V. Sobolev, Positive Linear Systems: The method of positive operators, Berlin, Helderman Verlag, 1989.

[24] N.M. Krylov, N.N. Bogolyubov, Les propriétés ergodiques des suites des probabilités en chaîne, CR Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 1937, 204, 1454-1546.

[25] N.V. Krylov, Introduction to the Theory of Random Processes, AMS, Providence, 2002.

[26] A. Kulik, Introduction to Ergodic Rates for Markov Chains and Processes, Potsdam university Press, Potsdam, 2015.

[27] T. Lindvall, Lectures on the Coupling Method (Dover Books on Mathematics) (paperback), 2002.

[28] A.A. Markov, Extension of the limit theorems of probability theory to a sum of variables connected in a chain (1906, in Russian), reprinted in Appendix B of: R. Howard. Dynamic Probabilistic Systems, volume 1: Markov Chains. John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

[29] S.V. Nagaev, A central limit theorem for discrete-time Markov processes. Selected Translations in Math. Stat. and Probab., 1968, 7, 156-164.

[30] S.V. Nagaev, The spectral method and the central limit theorem for general Markov chains, Dokl. Math. 2015, 91(1): 56-59.

[31] E. Nummelin, General Irreducible Markov Chains (Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics) (paperback), CUP, Cambridge, 2008.

[32] S.V. Papanicolaou, D. Stroock, S.R.S. Varadhan, Martingale approach to some limit theorems, in: Statistical Mechanics, Dynamical Systems and the Duke Turbulence Conference, Ed. by D. Ruelle, Duke Univ. Math. Series, Vol. 3, Durham, N.C., 1977. ftp://171.64.38.20/pub/papers/papanicolaou/pubs_old/martingale_duke_77.pdf

[33] E. Pardoux, A.Yu. Veretennikov, On Poisson equation and diffusion approximation 2, Annals of Probability, 2003, 31(3), 1166–1192.

[34] A. Puhalskii, Large Deviations and Idempotent Probability, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton et al., 2001.

[35] R.T. Rockafellar, Convex Analysis, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics and Physics (paperback), 1997.

[36] E. Seneta, Non-negative Matrices and Markov Chains, 2nd ed., Springer, New York et al, 1981.

[37] E. Seneta, Markov and the Birth of Chain Dependence Theory, International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique, 1996, 64(3), 255–263.

[38] H. Thorisson, Coupling, Stationarity, and Regeneration, Springer, New York, 2000.

[39] V.N. Tutubalin, Theory of probability and random processes, 1992, MSU, Moscow (in Russian).

[40] S.R.S. Varadhan, Large Deviations and Applications, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1984.

[41] L.N. Vaserstein, Markov Processes over Denumerable Products of Spaces, Describing Large Systems of Automata, Problems of Information Transmission, 1969, 5(3), 47-52.

[42] A.Yu. Veretennikov, Bounds for the Mixing Rate in the Theory of Stochastic Equations, Theory Probab. Appl. 1987, 32, 273-281.

[43] A.Yu. Veretennikov, On large deviations for systems of Itô stochastic equations. Theory Probab. Appl. 1991, 36(4), 772-782.

[44] A.Yu. Veretennikov, On polynomial mixing bounds for stochastic differential equations, Stoch. Processes Appl. 1997, 70, 115-127.

[45] A.Yu. Veretennikov, On polynomial mixing and convergence rate for stochastic difference and differential equations, Theory Probab. Appl. 2001, 45(1), 160–163.

[46] A.Yu. Veretennikov, Parameter and non-parametric estimation for Markov chains, Publ. House of Applied Studies, Mechanics and Mathematics Faculty, Mocow State University, 2000 (in Russian).

[47] A.D. Wentzell, A course in the theory of random processes, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1981.